

**Russian Academic Emigrants:
Academic Lives Disrupted and
Reconnected**

Irina Isaakyan

**PhD
The University of Edinburgh**

2008

Declaration

I, Irina Isaakyan, hereby certify that this doctoral thesis has been composed by me, that it is my own work and that it has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Signature:

Date: 10 July 2008

Acknowledgements

Warm thanks to my supervisors Professor Jenny Ozga and Dr. Ken McCulloch, without whose guidance and encouragement I would not have managed.

Abstract

The thesis takes as its starting point the idea of academic mobility, which is present in many policy texts and in discussions of the globalisation of higher education, and subjects that idea to critical scrutiny in the light of the lived experience of academics who have chosen to leave their homelands. In exploring the mobility issue, the particular concepts enable the illumination of academic work and life as disrupted and discontinuous. Discontinuity is related to such concepts as identity and exile, and I use a number of anthropological approaches to reassess the concept of academic career as a life journey that shapes identity through processes that may disrupt as well as advance careers and that corrode as well as affirm identities. The thesis uses biographical methods to explore and understand the experiences of Russian academics working in the UK and the USA, who may be understood as living - to some extent - in conditions of exile. These academics left Soviet or early post-Soviet Russia for Universities in the West, and constitute representatives of the international academic diaspora. This example serves to complicate the idea of academic mobility as a straightforward issue in which a global academic market produces opportunities for the free movement of talented labour, and to raise some critical issues about the extent to which this decontextualised vision of academic work is possible. The thesis also attempts to show the enduring effects of early career socialisation on later experiences, and to connect the specific context of Russia and Russian academic traditions to the shaping of the academy in globalising conditions. Finally, the thesis attempts, through this study of particular individuals, to add a degree of complexity and human experience to the literature on the globalisation of the academy, which often discusses developments at a very high level of abstraction, that is not sufficiently attentive to difference.

Contents

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION 7

 TOPIC AND CONCEPTS 7

CHAPTER 2. PROTEUS: ACADEMIC CAREER AND GLOBALIZATION 22

 INTRODUCTION: GLOBALIZATION AND IDENTITY 22

 CAREER CONCEPT 26

 COMPLEXITIES OF ACADEMIC LIFE 31

Individuality and membership 31

Academic identities 36

 GLOBALIZATION AND THE CHANGING CONTEXT OF ACADEMIC WORK 43

 ACADEMIC MOBILITY 47

 CONCLUSION 55

CHAPTER 3. RUSSIA AND RUSSIAN ACADEMY: FROM TOTALITARIANISM TO GLOBALIZATION 57

 INTRODUCTION 57

 NEW NATION OF POST-MODERNITY: A POLITICAL TEENAGER 59

A two-headed bride 60

New empire and Circe's touch 62

Intellectual dissent 64

The end of the empire: the USSR posthumous 65

 RUSSIAN ACADEMIA UNDER THE MICROSCOPE 67

Russian academic capitalism 67

Knowledge production and academic emigration 72

 ANTI-SEMITISM IN SOVIET HIGHER EDUCATION 78

 CONCLUSION 82

CHAPTER 4. METHODOLOGY: INTERPRETATIVE BIOGRAPHY 83

 INTRODUCTION 83

 UNDERSTANDING INTERPRETIVE BIOGRAPHY 83

Evolution of the life history method 83

Interpretive Logic: Legitimization of Subjectivity or Panoramic Vision through Close-ups 85

A processual model of power 89

 MY RESEARCH 94

Topic and purpose 94

Case and its sensitivity 96

Gestalt mosaicing: researcher's role and data collection 98

Data analysis 102

 EXPERIMENTING WITH INTERPRETIVE RESEARCH: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF A SENSITIVE CASE .. 103

 CONCLUSION 107

CHAPTER 5. FINDINGS: ACADEMIC CAREER CHRONICLE 109

 INTRODUCTION 109

 INDIVIDUAL STORIES AND CAREER TRAJECTORIES 110

The story of F(X): Cinderella and dissident 110

The story of F(D): Paradise lost and regained 117

The story of F(Z): Jewish dream 120

The story of M(X): Mathematician by default and academic gypsy 122

The story of M(E): 'Organic intellectual' – Buccaneer, scientist and poet 125

The story of M(S): Doctor and anti-sovetchik 128

 MOTIVATION FOR ACADEMIC CAREER 133

Falling in love 133

Vocational maturity 140

<i>Summary of motivation</i>	148
PROGRESSION AND ACCREDITATION IN THE SOVIET ACADEMY	150
EMIGRATION: BEFORE AND AFTERWARDS	162
<i>The last days in the Soviet empire</i>	163
<i>Emigration routes and post-exilic career</i>	168
CONCLUSION	175
CHAPTER 6. FINDINGS: SELF-PERCEPTION IN EXILE	176
INTRODUCTION	176
POSITIVE MEMORIES: 'ACADEMIC EDEN' AND 'HEROES'	176
NEGATIVE MEMORIES	188
<i>Violence and anti-intellectualism</i>	188
<i>Academic non-placement: Academic quagmires and airports</i>	199
<i>Academic tribalism</i>	205
<i>Soviet anti-Semitism</i>	216
PERCEPTION OF GLOBAL ACADEMIC WORK: WEST VERSUS EAST.....	220
CONCLUSION	229
CHAPTER 7. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: POWER AND AMBIVALENCE IN ACADEMIC LIFE	230
INTRODUCTION	230
ACADEMIC 'DRIFT'	231
<i>Academic frogs and orcas</i>	232
<i>Opening new chapters: Academic mobility and improvisation</i>	237
ACADEMIC COSMOPOLITANISM AND RUSSIANNES: IDENTITIES IN EXILE	243
<i>Academic diaspora</i>	243
<i>Nostalgia</i>	250
<i>Final destination: Diaspora without homeland?</i>	256
CONCLUSION	264
REFERENCES	269
APPENDIX A: TRANSLATED TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW WITH SLAVIK, WHO IS M(Y) AND F(Y)'S HUSBAND	290
APPENDIX B: TRANSLATED TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW WITH VALYA, WHO IS F(Y) AND M(Y)'S WIFE	314
APPENDIX C: ETHNO-DRAMA 'VOICES FROM THE CYCLOPS' CAVE'	331
LIST OF CHARACTERS	331
ACT I: ENTERING THE CAVE	333
ACT II: ACADEMIC DARWIN	345
ACT III: THIN ICE	348
APPENDIX D: PLAY 'CYCLOPS' CAVE' (ABRIDGED)	352
LIST OF CHARACTERS.....	352
ACT I: ENTERING THE CAVE	353
ACT II: THIN ICE	356
CHARTS	361

Chapter 1. Introduction

Topic and concepts

This thesis uses biographical methods to explore and understand the experiences of Russian academics working in the UK and the USA, who may be understood as living - to some extent - in conditions of exile. These academics left Soviet or early post-Soviet Russia for Universities in the West, and constitute representatives of the 'diaspora of professors, scientists, and intellectuals' from the so-called 'peripheral world' (Altbach 2002: 8). The thesis takes as its starting point the idea of academic mobility, which is present in many policy texts and in discussions of the globalisation of higher education (see for example Altbach (2002; 2004), Marginson (2008), Smeby and Trondal (2005) and Welch and Zhen (2008)) and subjects that idea to critical scrutiny in the light of the lived experience of academics who have chosen to leave their homeland.

The case of the Russian academic diaspora is, of course, an extreme one, given the complexity of conditions of academic work in Soviet Russia, and also the rapid exodus or 'brain drain' from post-Soviet Russia. The example - though extreme - serves to illuminate the concepts of academic career and academic mobility as central issues in the emerging discourse of higher education globalization to challenge the idea of decontextualised academic work, as advertised in this discourse. To summarise, the thesis explores the following research questions:

- a) What are the most essential features of academic careers and academic identities?
- b) What are the key elements in the globalisation of higher education? How do these relate to key characteristics of traditional academic work and life?
- c) How was the Russian academy affected by globalising developments in higher education? How did those developments relate to traditional characteristics of academic work and life in Russia?
- d) What light can biographical research on Russian academics now working in the West cast on these questions?
- e) What significance does this evidence have from the point of view of understanding the changes in academic work and life that are currently in process globally?

I aim to examine the lives, work and identities of twenty-three academic emigrants from Russia and to analyse the meanings they attach to their experiences. This knowledge is meant to develop a better understanding of the factors that may contribute to academic mobility. To achieve this, I look upon academic life as 'chiefly a vast interpretative process in which people, singly and collectively, guide themselves by defining the objects, events, and situations which they encounter' (Blumer 1956: 686).

In the interpretive exploration of the questions mentioned above, a range of theoretical resources will be drawn upon, that enable the illumination of academic work and life as disrupted and discontinuous. Discontinuity is related to such central concepts as identity and exile, and I use the anthropological approaches of Sennett (1998) and Bateson (1985) to reassess the concept of academic career as a life journey that shapes identity through processes that may disrupt as well as advance careers and that corrode as well as affirm identities. Discontinuity is obviously inherent in exile, which conveys the idea of displacement or dislocation. The thesis uses the idea of exile both literally and metaphorically. I study exile as the condition of emigration, requiring new national identities, and also as a form of social exclusion or non-placement. My analysis of exile and non-placement (as the setting of displacement or disruption) draws on the ideas of Bauman (1991) and Augé's opponent Miller (1998), who stress the reciprocity between exile and productivity and between non-placement and anthropologically rich experience of life.

Literatures frequently advocate the idea of what I would like to conceptualise as 'prolific' or 'reflexive exile' and stress its advantages for travelling intellectuals (Bauman 1991; Levy & Weinrod 2005). Intellectual voyages break the academics' 'neolithic revolution' by turning their routes from 'a settled life' to 'a nomadic life' (Bauman op cit: 90) and thus placing them 'at the bend of the river' (Said 2000). Exilic uncertainty should be understood as one of the preconditions of true intellectualism since any 'ambivalence...is a normal condition of intellectual life' (Bauman op cit: 1). In this connection, Levy and Weinrod (op cit: 5) remark that the best masterpieces are those made in the exilic 'creative arena'. That is why though the daily experience of intellectual émigrés may be 'harsh and frustrating' the overall exilic life is 'vibrant and internally creative' (op cit: 19).

As is evident from these studies, exile often offers productive conditions for professional achievement among intellectuals and consequently, for gaining recognition and exercising power. Resonating with this, Miller (1998) does not recognise a distinct borderline between non-places (the places of disruption or places devoid of positive meaning) and anthropologically rich places (the places that facilitate the exercise of power and may thus enrich our identities). This understanding derives from the scholarly debate between him and Auge (1995), the author of the “non-place” anthropological theory.¹ According to Auge (op cit: 77), ‘non-places are spaces...lacking any historical significance and strong symbolism’. On the contrary, he views an ‘anthropologically rich place’ as ‘relational, historical and concerned with identity’ (op cit). In response to this statement, Miller (1998: 28) remarks that many of the transitional localities conceptualised by Auge as ‘non-places’ *do* ‘have their own distinguished identity, their specific sense of place, and histories that are visible and discernable’.

These theoretical resources suggest a rich and complex interrelationship between the problems and difficulties of exile and the enriching and empowering effects that it may have. In foregrounding discontinuity as a key theme, I try to see what stands behind it; how far it is recognised and acknowledged by my informants, and what meanings they give to it. How do migrating academics search for meanings and shape their identities in their life journeys through the conditions of exile and disruption? Is there a tendency to seek power, and is there evidence of a neurotic search for academic power, status and recognition? Thus my research concerns academic life in the trans-national context or academic life as a ‘trans-national social space’ (Kivisto 2001: 550). This is the life of a Russian academic emigrant – a life marked with discontinuity and constant self-renewal.

This specific case is nested within a growing literature on academic mobility, academic cosmopolitanism and new geographies of identity (Altbach 2004; Germann-Molz 2005; Lingard 2006). Within that literature, there is a tendency to study cosmopolitan experiences and the emergence of new identities from the perspective of qualitative research, through in-depth studies of particular groups

¹ Auge’s (1995) theory is actually based on the concept of “non-place” initially offered by Webber in 1964 (see Miller 1998).

(Gudmundsdóttir 2003; Hoffman 1990; Pattie 2005). However academic mobility, and perhaps especially the phenomenon known as 'brain drain' has not been explored through studies of experience but is the preserve of quantitative studies of flows of exporters and importers, winners and losers in higher education (Altbach 2002; 2004). While such studies are necessary, there is a danger that they accept the policy logic of 'mobility' as unproblematic and see the need for technical, rather than social knowledge of the nature of academic mobility. There is a danger that the absence of social scientific research in this field will produce a situation in which migrating academics are invisible or obscure to their Western colleagues and students – as well as from social science itself. My research seeks to show how complex and controversial academic life and identity can be when characterised by such factors as enslavement by and emancipation from totalitarianism, societal transitions and adjustment to a new, foreign, culture – especially when all these forces act together in their impact upon identities.

Thesis organization

Since I study academic mobility through looking at the identities and working lives of academic people who have left their homeland for global places, I would like to open my research with a discussion of the concept of globalization and with the analysis of its impact upon identity and academic work. To understand the overall panorama of the societal dislocations caused by global flows, let us follow Omaha's (1994) advice and imagine the 'borderless world', filled in with new 'ideoscapes', 'mediascapes', 'technoscapes', 'ethnoscapes' and 'financescapes' – the new global parameters observed by Appadurai (1996). This is how he explains the de-contextualization of people's lives – through the emergence of hybrid ideologies, media formats and informational innovations, increased international transportation, ethno-national/diasporic cultures and the borderless circulation of trans-national capital. As Castells (1998; 2000) remarks, the new trans-national alliances and political configurations largely contribute to this 'Visa credit card' effect – as witnessed by Levy and Weinrod (2005: 9) – when life and work becomes de-contextualised but no one knows for sure who is responsible for this high order of human mobility because there seems to be no 'overarching control mechanism'.

Thus the globalizing world may resemble 'chaorder' and appear 'chaotic and uncontrolled, non-predictable and spontaneous, yet operating within an orderly framework' (op cit).

According to Altbach (2002; 2004) and Marginson (2008), academic work is particularly affected by this global de-contextualization since, by definition, the turbo-economy is meant to be de-contextualised. Giddens' (2000) 'runaway world' opens many doors and offers new dimensions for academic mobility. All these researches invite us to think about the following questions. What is academic mobility? What makes the academic person mobile? Being mobile, to what extent is he/she still connected to his old location – that is, to what extent does this global academic mobility contain stasis? How does globalization help academics understand their own movement? Offered a variety of terms to define their new working conditions – such as 'academic mobility' (Altbach 2004; Marginsson 2008), 'academic cosmopolitanism' (Lingard 2006; Rizvi 2004; 2006), 'academic diaspora' (Altbach op cit; Kuznetsov & Sabel 2006) and 'international contact' (Trondal & Smeby 2005) – how do the global academics themselves conceptualise this way of life? How do they themselves understand their new living space – that of the cosmopolitan academy?

As I try to show in Chapter 2, the idea of the global academy as a product of globalisation has been recently firmly established in the academic literature (Altbach 2002; 2004; Castells 1998; 2000; Lingard 2006; Rizvi 2004; 2006). Globalization - with the parameters mentioned above – has caused today's Western Universities to operate in an entirely new cultural and economic space, supported by new political regulations. For example, Kuznetsov and Sabel (2006) discuss various governmental policies in both sending and receiving countries to support academic trans-national networks. Marginson (2008) observes that such initiatives may lead the reader to think that the nation-state does not control brain drain anymore.

In other words, this emerging space is what is meant by the concept of global academy. This *functionally new* space is the nucleus of the emerging knowledge industry and the main principle within this new space is trans-nationalism. Thus within this new space, the new economy is created through international grants, conferences, fellowships and trans-national employment. A totally new culture, the

culture of academic cosmopolitanism, is emerging and a key requirement of its future is academic mobility. This is exactly how the cosmopolitan academy is being created. As Altbach (2004), Gray (2006), Florida (2004; 2005) and many others observe, western and northern geo-areas attract more and more talented people from the periphery. Thus the success of globalization depends on a global academy labourforce, one of whose chief constituents is academic migration from the East to the West (Kuznetsov & Sabel 2006). A major element of this large-scale dislocation is the brain drain from the former Soviet bloc. However, many researchers, including Altbach (2004) and Kuznetsov and Sabel (2006), insist on conceptualizing this phenomenon as 'brain circulation' or 'academic trans-nationalism' and suggest a direct connection between the academies of 'global' and 'closed' (or semi-global) societies – the latter including the post-Soviet Russia. All these studies emphasise the complexity of this particular relationship, thus placing Russian academics into the midst of scientific debates.

This thesis suggests that the academic culture of the Soviet Union, the citadel of the totalitarian modernity, is still found in global Universities, and is carried there through the continued orientation to work and life of migrants in exile. The brain drain from Russia may even result in the 'Russification' of Western science, according to the scientific predictions of Gerber and Yarsike-Ball (2002). Former Soviet academics and, particularly, those from Russia – the strong academic centre of the former USSR – are at the heart of this journey from totalitarian modernity to the liberal or civic post-modernity. Sceptics would probably say that a sending society is 'like the walnut tree that spills its blessed fruit to nourish foreign soils' (Sylva Gaboudikian 1985 cited in Pattie 2005: 52). In sharp contrast, global hyperbolisers may see the current diasporas as 'arenas for the creative melting of cultures and other formations' (Levy & Weinrod 2005: 19). Thus Soviet academics, along with faculty members from all over the world, may become the reserve workforce utilised by educational globalization. Looking at them from this angle, do we recognise Gaboudikian's 'nourishment of foreign soils' or Levy and Weinrod's 'glorification of diaspora' effect? This is the question I try to answer in my thesis. Looking at it through a variety of prisms in all the chapters, I always find myself

returning to the concept of globalization, which is not just a concept anymore – here it turns into the context within which academic lives obtain their new meanings.

In this context, globalization becomes a force that gives discontinuity - including discontinuity in academic life and work – its normative status. The condition of constant disruption and its impact upon identity - what may be seen in Sennet's (1998) terms, as the 'corrosion of character' – emerge as universal phenomena. So too do their more specific manifestations in academic life, such as academic gate keeping, academic games (or academic wars) of position, and academic tribalism. Of course emigration has a long history, but the most recent global changes create new conditions, according to Bauman (1998), turning 'pariahs' into new, standpoint identities with a normative status. Bauman (op cit: 24-30) says, 'Pariah...(outcast)...belongs nowhere. But [late] modernity proclaimed no order untouchable...a pariah could stop being a pariah by becoming a parvenu...endless traveller'. That is why I look at globalization, which introduces new parameters of identity formation, as the overall background against which people re-invent themselves. This is where I initially located my informants and this is where they are placed now, trying to recall their entire lives.

In this thesis I draw on the work of Bauman (1997; 1998) and Appadurai (1996), in particular on their emphasis on the unpredictability of the apparently unlimited identity opportunities created by globalization. Still these unlimited opportunities are somehow bound to local settings, since the brain circulation, an illustrative case of globalization, involves two ends – the recipient and the donor. That is why, in Chapter 3 I look at the most powerful brain donor – the Russian academy – and consider the factors that might make academics leave this country for 'foreign soils'. This analysis of the modifying Soviet and post-Soviet 'scapes' – as Appadurai (1996) would probably call the changing Russian socio-political scenery – helps to show how the Soviet legacy continues to impact upon identities. This knowledge is important for us to see how the post-mortem influence of the destroyed Soviet empire may become even stronger at a distance in view of the fact that globalization 'intensifies' localities (Giddens 1990). It is interesting to see how while looking at the world around them, academic exiles perceive these local and temporal intensifications.

Technically speaking, within the direct focus of this study are the trans-national *identities* of Russian academic emigrants. In my research I study academic mobility through interpretive inquiry into academic identities. According to Bauman (2001) and Foucault (1983), identity studies act as a viable tool to understand the world around us, with its broader phenomena. Thus when looked at from the processual angle, identity becomes instrumental for biographic researchers. The processual aspect of identity means that identity should be viewed in Foucauldian terms – that is, as an open-textured process – which is resonant with the anthropological approaches of ‘life as an improvisatory art’ and the ‘disruption-reconnection of life’. In the opinion of Epstein (1978: 10), identity ‘represents the process by which the person seeks to integrate his various statuses and roles, as well as his diverse experiences, into a coherent image of self’.

As remarked on by Hogg et al. (1995: 262), the processual aspect of identity suggests the emphasis on its content – ‘the acquisition of psychological traits, expectations, customs, beliefs, and ideologies that are associated with belonging to a particular social group or category’. Thus the concept of identity inevitably leads us to its ‘collective’ aspect: when someone accumulates certain distinct features as an individual, this acquisition takes place alongside with his identification with a certain social group. Hogg and colleagues conclude that identity is ‘an active process of shaping and forging an image of what the group stands for and how it wishes to be viewed by others’ (Hogg et al.: 262).

Therefore my approach to identity is grounded in Foucault’s (1983) idea that ‘the self is not given to us’ (Foucault 1983). In this connection, Bauman (2001) points out to identity invention under conditions of transition. Thus he says, ‘As soon as community collapses, identity is invented’ (2001: 151). Campbell and Rew (1999: 7) approach identity as a multi-faceted self-construction and re-invention:

The implication for the construction of identity is that no design can be taken as foolproof – each life-project consists of successive trials and errors and since it lacks a benchmark against which to measure progress, the identity of the agent is marked by the incessant activity of self-construction.

Writing about the identity process, Hogg et al. (1995: 262) define the individual life, or the individual self, as ‘an organised system’, within which

‘managing multiple identities is something like an internal juggling act’. They further remark that the organised system of the self ‘structures the relationships among different identities and determines which identity is invoked at a particular time as a function of the relative salience and centrality of identities within and across social situations’. This opinion resonates very well with Bourdieu’s (1988) views on academic life as a ‘self’-system that can structure the hierarchy of academic cultural values and identities in a universalistic fashion, across various cultural contexts.

Referring to its complex structure and the absence of benchmarks, Bauman (2001: 152) defines identification as ‘a never-ending, always incomplete, unfinished and open-ended activity in which we all, by necessity or by choice, are engaged’. According to Foucault (1983), ‘we have to create ourselves as a work of art’. The creativity of the identification process is often assessed by its gestalt – the image of the self created in personal and collective narratives. Bauman (2001: 143) remarks that people’s identities frequently lead researchers to think of Proteus - who ‘turning from man into a lion, a wild boar or a snake, a stone or a tree’, is universally recognised as the ‘grandmaster of instant re-incarnation... self-constitution and self-assertion’. Thus identities and careers should be viewed as ‘protean’ or associated with the gestalt of Proteus (Bruner 1991).

It is evident from all these opinions, that identity is often viewed as a process that is (a) open, (b) self-constructed and (c) imaginary (or based on the representation of the self). In other words, we *are* what we want others to see us. The image we construct about ourselves (the *gestalt*) may be either realistic or futuristic – the latter most likely. The important question is how to deliver this gestalt to others – which is the ultimate goal of our self-identification. If identity is an outcome of and a response to change, we can ask if it is possible to capture the change and by what means. In reference with the processual aspect of identities, a way to understand and analyse change and identity is a story, especially understood through the prism of interpretive biography. According to Faber (2002: 21), ‘Change itself is a story, and stories are acts of change. The stories we read, watch, hear, create, and enact are powerful, interpretive acts. They provide...continuity’. As he further explains:

Stories provide a cultural record of who we are, where we have been, and what we hope to achieve. Stories document our habits, success,

failures, and lessons learned. They place our culture's defining events, oddest moments, and strategic messages into common narratives we assimilate and refine. In the process [of story-telling], we add to these stories different expressions, subtle distinctions, and small deviations. We leave our details we believe are unimportant, information we forget, and issues we would rather not remember (Faber 2002: 21).

Thus Faber (2002: 20) recognises stories as 'agents of change' and believes that our identities are actually constructed through our stories. In fact, if our identities are about how we want others to see us – this message can be mostly delivered through our storytelling. As seen from Faber above, telling life stories and understanding who you are and how others may understand you involve meticulous comprehension and elaboration of various concepts and details related to human lives. That is why identity studies are more than just the studies of individual lives. They are the studies of our society. In the opinion of Bauman (2001: 140), 'identity has now become a prism through which other topical aspects of contemporary life are spotted, grasped and examined'.

In many cases, identities are studied to understand the overall societal culture. Because both identity and culture 'touch the core of the self', the analysis of the 'identity-culture' relationship is paramount in interpretive research on fundamental issues such as national identity or nation (Epstein 1978: 101):

[Cultural] concepts and models [for shaping identities] are not static – they must be understood in reference with their particular cultural, political and historical contexts...construction and representation of [self – national and professional] in various social, political, historical and economic contexts (Leslie & McGee 2000: 3).

Using these Foucauldian approaches to the studies of life and identities, I thus aim to examine the intersection of professional and national identities of Russian academic emigrants and also to understand the more complex notion of identity and academic work as it relates to cultural and economic ideas about the basic concepts of academic paradise, mobility, cosmopolitanism, exile and Russianness (or Sovietishness).

In particular, I try to examine the concepts of academic mobility and global academic work through the study on the evolution of the informants' identities. This transformation is congruent with Glaser's (1959) understanding of 'turning points'.

According to Glaser (op cit: 93), there are 'certain critical incidents that occur to force a person to recognise that "I am not the same as I was, as I used to be"'. And in my case, some incidents lead the informants to recognise in retrospect that academic work is not the same as it was before. Glaser (1959: 100) stresses the 'socializing effect' of turning points helping us to see their relevance to the changing social context of academic work:

The same kinds of incidents that precipitate the revision of identity are extremely likely to befall and to be equally significant to other persons of the same generation, occupation and social class (op cit).

Thus through the prism of the participants' identities, I try to show how the context of academic work changes and what processes are actually taking place within the cosmopolitan academy, as comprised of mobile people like my informants.

Because the main concepts of my work are mobility and exile, I would describe my interpretive biographical approach as '*thematic biography*' (Coffey 1996: 68). Thematic biography focuses on life experiences that are relevant to explain a particular topic. The academic biography of my informants incorporates immigrant biography. The academic life, or academic biography, focuses on the issue of mobility or movement toward the 'academic paradise' (Geertz 1983), whereas the immigrant biography centres around the 'construction of *trans-national (border-crossing) social spaces*', defined by Kivisto (2001: 567) as 'a boundary-breaking process in which two or more nation-states are penetrated by and become part of a *singular new social space* that provides for the circulation of ideas, symbols, and material culture'. Campbell and Rew (1999: 1) understand the trans-national social space as a cultural 'duplex' or 'semi-detached mental habitat', in which people may live and 'one half of which is global and the other local'. Narrating such trans-national social spaces or identity duplexes, the biographies of immigrants focus on their transition from one culture to another (Hoffman 1990). And these accounts may portray the sense of 'belonging' as 'dependent on the multiple discourses that form individuals into a collective narrative rather than any 'natural' geographical cohesion' (Popkewitz 2001: 184).

To understand trans-national academic mobility and relations within the cosmopolitan academy, I try to show *who* the academic immigrants are and what they think about the world around them – that is, to show how their vision of the world is influenced by their memories and prior experiences. According to independent studies, in narrative biographies, in general, and in immigrant biographies, in particular, the past is inseparable from the present: they interweave in one temporal pattern (Gudmundsdóttir: 2003). I would like to call this interaction the ‘trans-temporal social space’ – in which the memories are imposed on the immigrants’ recent reflections. This trans-temporal social space emerges as a result of the logic of the retrospective memoir, which, according to Glaser (1959: 92), leads to ‘take stock, re-evaluate, re-see and re-judge’ but from one’s ‘*new* status’. In this regard, I try to show that the academic paradise emerges as part of this nostalgically constructed trans-temporal social space – the place to which they move, as constructed by themselves. And here I am interested in the processual aspect of this construction – in what situations and through what techniques they create the most desired places in their life journeys and later follow them.

There are a number of techniques that help me to discuss their life stories. Looking in Chapter 4 at the method of interpretive biography and its connectedness with Foucault’s understanding of power, I then illustrate the application of such techniques in the consequent two chapters. While presenting my findings, I follow the basic requirements for interpretive biographies (Coffey 1996; Denzin 1989). First, I show the informants’ entire lives, their stories and the overall context around them. Here I use the classic biographical approach – I give the chronicle of their lives as based on factual information. At the beginning of Chapter 5, I show individual lives and then the coordinated life – their collective biography. In the presentation of each stage of their collective biography, I try to analyse a particular phenomenon important for our understanding of their career development. Second, I show the most crucial turning points in their lives in Chapter 6 by using Glaser’s (1959) approach. Having introduced the concept of ‘turning/crucial point’, Glaser (op cit) suggests that we look at turning points through concentrating on the memories and identity shifts caused during the period within which these points occur. Finally – and this is the foremost requirement for in-depth unstructured interviews – I allow

my informants to choose what they would like to tell me – what factual information and what reflections on it they would like to share with me. This is a significant way to understand what experiences are really important for them. As this research is based largely on their own interpretation and understanding of their own experiences, at the beginning of each interview, I asked them, ‘Imagine that you are a filmmaker who is making the autobiographical film or a screenwriter writing the autobiographical screenplay. Please think about what you would want this film to be about. What would you like this film to start with and how would you like me to understand your idea of your own life?’

That explains why their Soviet experiences occupy such a big place in transnational biographies – because they have decided that this should be so. This is how they construct their living spaces – through their Soviet experiences, which emerge as their ‘national’ or ‘diasporic memories’ (Clifford 1994). Their Soviet experiences are the major part of their lives, as Chapter 6 shows. The Soviet academic life was more static in terms of mobility but more dynamic in terms of inter-personal relations and academic wars. Their turning points are their Soviet experiences. And even their emigration was the final link in the chain of their Soviet experiences, initiated by their Soviet contacts. Preparing for emigration, they started to build their ‘reservoir airdromes’ while still in the Soviet Union (Nazarov 2004). Their identities are largely affected and diluted by globalization but the main essence in this cosmopolitan identity cocktail is their *Sovietishness*. I have coined this term in reference to the collection of the positive Soviet traits the informants believe to possess and try to reproduce through their nostalgic reminiscences. In the discussion part of my thesis, which is Chapter 7, I develop this argument and see how their Soviet legacy is incorporated into their cosmopolitanism in a variety of ways.

Addressing their Soviet experiences, the discussion of my findings relates to the question about where this Sovietishness places them in the global world. Knowing that they are still Soviet Russian academics, it is, nevertheless, interesting to try to understand their simultaneous international or cosmopolitan membership. This is not an easy task and it does not provide us direct answers. However, this identification can be conceptualised as academic diaspora. And here I look at more

than one meaning conveyed in this concept as the informants themselves are invited to decipher it.

Conceptualizing themselves as academic diasporans, both Russian and cosmopolitan – and without any contradiction within this double self-identification – my interviewees eventually ask themselves whether their cosmopolitan academic lives have been successful and congruent with their main purpose. This understanding comes through the analysis of their academic mobility. There is no uniform understanding of academic mobility. In the classic, anthropological, understanding – it is movement toward the academic paradise (Geertz 1983; Weiland 1995). Recently – within the context of globalization – academic mobility is understood in trans-national, geo-, terms (Musselin 2004). I look at the academic mobility from the point of view of anthropology – as a movement toward paradise – the so-called ‘motivational mobility’ – and also look at what part of this search for paradise belongs to the trans-national mobility – how trans-national mobility is incorporated into the overall search for academic paradise.

As my research and that of others suggest, academic mobility cannot be understood through the prism of simplistic, two axial, geometry – that is, in vertical and horizontal terms only. It is a more complex phenomenon that, coming back to Geertz (1983), reflects the movement toward or around the ‘academic paradise’ as a desired academic affiliation. And because the concept of academic paradise has very vague parameters, there must be a variety of paths within this route – the paths of different configurations and directions. Moreover, academic mobility must depend on the social context around academic work. Thus in the trans-national context – that is, of the global University, with trans-national alliances and various forms of international contact - the mobility of an academic immigrant will not be the same as the mobility of a very local academic.

The nature of this mobility is not to be found in a transition from one position to another or even from one institution to another. It is transition to another country and another culture – the transition within which a variety of processes is involved. These processes may foster or impede mobility. They may *help* an academic to be mobile and, at the same time, *prevent* him/her from being mobile. Thus trans-national academic mobility involves the processes of the formation of diasporic

consciousness among migrating academics, their struggle with nostalgia and their adjustment to the requirements of the Western educational market. These factors will determine how successfully the person will move 'upwards' – the direction that is also very amorphous in the academic world. That is why 'upward/downward mobility' should be understood metaphorically when applying to the academic profession – that is, in terms of reaching one's academic paradise. The direction of this movement depends on your prior experiences and on your understanding of them. This identity shift – thinking back to your pre-exilic academic life, connecting it with your recent position and evaluating them altogether from the present, global (or cosmopolitan) perspective, is probably the answer to the question how the changing, 'runaway' world and your own place in it should be understood.

Chapter 2. Proteus: Academic career and globalization

Ineluctable modality of the visible...world
without end...

(James Joyce, *Ulysses*, Episode 3)

Introduction: Globalization and identity

As I have already mentioned, the main issue in my research is the socio-anthropological vision of academic career and mobility, including the impact of globalization upon them. Because this impact has been tremendous and also because my informants now evaluate their entire lives through the prism of their global experiences, I would like to open my research with the concept of globalization and with the analysis of its applications to the context of academic work. Here I show how the globalizing world is usually understood and how the post-modern identities shape in it. After explaining the notion of academic career, I examine to what extent academic life becomes post-modernised, or where exactly in this global post-modernity academics are located. Throughout this chapter I seek to answer the question of what moments of disruption and identity crisis are universal and how academic people's attitudes to them change with the advent of globalization.

Below is how Becker (2003) and Giddens (1990) conceptualise globalization; offering two distinct, yet not mutually exclusive, opinions. Becker sees globalization through the prism of economic, informational and cultural exchanges and management of these new exchanges; whereas Giddens primarily recognises new forms of social identity and social geography in the emerging global flows:

Globalization is the way in which commerce, information and culture are increasingly exchanged and managed on a world-wide, rather than local or national, basis...Globalization is the worldwide integration of human capital and the compression of both the temporal and spatial dimensions of planet-wide human interaction (Becker 2003).

Globalization is the intensification of worldwide social relations that link distant events: what happens locally is shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa (Giddens 1990).

The most well-known characteristics of globalization, conveyed in these and many other definitions, are pinpointed by Morrow and Torres (2000) as post-Fordist production, new informational technologies and neo-liberal (privatization) practices. Burbules and Torres (2000: 28) select 'the information society' and 'the global spread of post-modern culture' as key features. Globalization encompasses 'the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole', remarks Robertson (1992: 8); while Giddens (1990) highlights 'deterritorialization' in the quotation above about the reciprocity, or inter-causality, between local happenings and distant events. In this connection, the transformational analysts of globalization think of it as 'the widening, intensifying, speeding up, and growing impact of world-wide interconnectedness' (Held & McGrew 1999: 2).

In this study, I refer to globalization both as a theory about and as a force directing the world's new relations. A reasonable question to ask would be what the global world actually is. Critical analysts of globalization stress its contribution to the erosion of local customs and the spiritual, economic and political exploitation of impoverished communities and localities by affluent ones, along with the commodification of human culture in general (Kellner 2002: 302). However Kellner also acknowledges globalization's beneficial effects in promoting cosmopolitanism and diversity. As is evident, it is impossible to precisely describe the globalizing world.

This 'ambivalence' of globalization (Bauman 1991; 1995), the source of all debates, is reflected in the conflict between different schools of global thought: hyperglobalists, sceptics and transformational analysts (Castles 2000; Held & McGrew 1999). The hyperglobalists, such as Omaha (1994), see globalization mostly in terms of the trans-national economic change and ignore the role of nation-state politics in steering these changes. The sceptics, for example Hirst and Thompson (1999), are 'cautious about the revolutionary character of globalization' and conceptualise the emerging new world order as no more than 'neo-imperialism'.

Unlike them, Held and McGrew (1999: 2) and other transformational analysts of globalization, with whom I broadly agree, firstly, recognise the new world order as 'the spatial re-organization and re-articulation of economic, political, military and cultural power'. Secondly, their understanding of globalization as 'a multi-dimensional process, which is not reducible to an economic logic and which has differential impacts across the world's regions and upon individual states', can be interpreted as their acknowledgement of the resilience of globalization and of its different 'modalities'.

In the majority of cases, scholars generally argue that the globalizing world is *being compressed*. However, they add that it is also *being expanded*. What exactly is happening to the world? Is it compressed or expanded? Through the prism of economic and cultural change, the world is probably compressed, or as Castells (2000) says, 'internally expanded'. This can be illustrated by the emerging 'turbo-economics' (Omahe 1994) and global culture, with its new '-scapes' (Appadurai 1996) and 'mass consumption' (Close & Ohki-Close 1999; Green 1997). It is possible to reflect on the global world as marked with cultural (a) compression and de-territorialization (found in converging cultures and emerging cosmopolitanism); (b) the simultaneous political expansion and contraction of nation-states (leading to the new world order);² and (c) economic re-territorialization (represented by turbo-capitalism and, particularly, by trans-national alliances).³

As evident from these different processes and approaches, globalization behaves differently in different spheres of life. In any case, globalization is recognised as the main direction of the epochal shift of 'post-modernity' or 'late modernity' (Burbules & Torres 2000; Giddens 1991; Featherstone 1988). But because globalization is a process with 'a relatively long-term effect' (Castells 1996:

² The process of *contraction* may be illustrated by 'the proliferation of sub-national discourses that dispute the authority of nation-states' and 'disrupt commonplace understandings of the nation-state as the natural scale of politics' (Ozga et al. 2006: 5). As an illuminative case, Beck (2000), in this connection, points to the USSR collapse. The other tendency – that toward 'external expansion' (Castles 2000) – covers the cases of the new Germany, the shaping EU or the current USA (the latter including Puerto-Rico as the fifty-first state).

³ For information on trans-nationalism and 'turbo-capitalism', see Omahe (1994) and Castells (2000).

95) and 'a nebulous concept...impossible to measure precisely' (GPF 2003) – post-modernity is also viewed as 'ambivalent' (Bauman 1995). Bauman (op cit) and Featherstone (1988) correspondingly think about post-modern identities as both 'liquid' and 'fragmented' - that is, bound to converging, yet distinct, cultures and fragments of life – 'disrupted and 'reconnected', adds Bateson (1995). Within this *fragmented ambivalence*, it is totally unclear what it means to be 'global' or 'post-modern' (Beck 2000; Green 1997; Kaldor 2004; Spybey 1996). Yet in this 'transformation of reality into [amorphous] images and the fragmentation of time' and space (Featherstone 1988: 198), the unquestionable component of global, or post-modern, thinking is 'accelerated people mobility' (Ozga et al. 2006: 4):

...individuals pursue jobs across the globe, seek economic advantage through migration, adventure as tourists, and flee as refugees and displaced persons from places disrupted by the destabilization of international relations and the established frameworks of nation-states and nationalisms (Ozga et al. op cit).

International mobility changes a person to a large extent and shapes his/her affiliation with more than one culture and with more than one temporal fragment – thus creating the 'trans-national social spaces' (Faist 2000; Kivisto 2001) and what I would like to call the 'trans-temporal social spaces'.⁴

The fragmented and ambivalent identity, one of the main issues in my thesis, can be understood in simple terms as consisting of two components – career identity and national identity (Giddens 1991). When asked about their identities, even people lost in post-modern ambivalence usually think about where they live and what they do for their living. This is how I use the identity concept in my study.

Still it is the national identity that is *de facto* recognised as the core of any identity formation, as well as the core of the changing, yet omni-present, nation-state. Because these two structures are being fundamentally challenged by global flows, researchers often use the terms 'identity' and 'national identity' interchangeably (Billig 1995; Pollini 2005; Venturelli-Christensen 2005). According to Greenfeld and Chirot (1994: 79), 'national identity constitutes what may be called the "fundamental

⁴ I will return to the concept of the 'trans-temporal social space' in Chapter 7 (*Discussion*).

identity”, the identity that is believed to define the very essence of the individual’. Thus speaking about the ‘human consequences’ of globalization (mentioned by Bauman in 1991), scholars stress the leading role of national affiliation in the process of self-identification. At same time, various studies emphasise that the geography of national identity becomes more and more ‘imaginary’ and ‘multi-layered’ (Germann-Molz 2005; Pollini 2005). Still this imagination is facilitated by a number of corporeal factors, related to career development and professional identity. In this respect, the work of Altbach (2004) and Glick-Schiller et al. (1995) shows that the majority of global labour migrants are driven by economic concerns such as better salaries and better working conditions. People often choose where to live depending on where they find employment. Thus international mobility becomes the bond between the national and professional elements within the concept of post-modern identity. That is why I understand the mobility-driven ‘global shifts’ in national identity as, in many cases, inseparable from what happens to people’s careers.

Career concept

If we approach the concept of career from the developmental perspective, there are certain stages in career development, offered by Super and colleagues (1965).⁵ During the growth stage, the person identifies his/her dominant interest. At the exploration stage, he/she enters the job market – through different routes and higher education is one of them – and tries a variety of career options. The establishment phase covers the most creative years of the person’s working life after he/she becomes vocationally mature and understands what he/she actually wants. The maintenance stage is what Bourdieu (1988) would describe as the benefits of confirmed reputations and accumulated capital. The decline stage is the time when the person leaves the road for others and/or passes the accumulated capital to his disciples. Super and colleagues do not insist on rigid age boundaries for each stage. Moreover, they stress that the vocational decline is the most individual time for people. However, thinking about the most active career progression, Super et al. point to the life span between high school and the age of forty-five, approximately.

⁵ See Chart 6 for the graphical summary of these stages.

In attempting to understand the application of this structure to academic lives, Clark (1986: 28) observes 'a starting gate (entry) and a finish line (retirement)' within 'the modern academic career'; while Baldwin and Blackburn (1981: 599) point to the dichotomy of the broadly defined career phases, as follows. Thus they write about 'a series of stable and transitional periods', 'a series of successes and disappointments' and 'difficult and easy career times'. Their research – as supported by other works, including their reference to Levinson – binds this approximate structure of the academic career to its motivation and explains the differences between the observed stages through the prism of 'career ambitions' and 'goals':

During stable periods the adult pursues fairly clear goals. But periodically, the individual must reorder priorities and change behaviour in order to compensate for neglected dimensions of the self (unfulfilled ambitions, newly acquired interests) (Baldwin & Blackburn 1981: 599).

As we can see, career – whether academic or organizational – is viewed as 'an evolutionary process' per se, 'driven by...ambitions firmly in place' (Baldwin & Blackburn op cit). It is the concept of vocational motivation that organises all found stages together. 'Motivation for what?', we can ask here. Bourdieu (1988) generally understands career motivation as a drive for status, capital accumulation, power and, consequently, identity. There is no specific definition of the concept of vocational motivation as such. In most cases, it is associated with 'career choice', 'expectations about work' (Clark 2004: 608), 'a pursuit of goals' (Baldwin & Blackburn 1981: 599) or all of these things together – which enables scholars to frequently use these terms interchangeably. If to approach motivation as vocational choice changing throughout life more than once, the following can be observed in the application of this concept to academic careers. According to Astin (1984: 119 as cited in Lindholm 2004: 608), academic career development is 'determined' by such 'principles' as 'survival, pleasure and contribution'. In other words, academics decide on making their careers in order to survive, to enjoy their work and to contribute to the community through this work. Lindholm mentions the contextually situational manifestations of this drive for survival, vocational pleasure and public contribution. The specific techniques of academic survival, pleasure and contribution – the techniques of the exercise of academic power (using the language of Bourdieu and

Foucault) – largely depend on the ‘cultural-environmental factors’ such as membership and resources for benefiting from this membership (Lindholm 2004: 608). As Lindholm further notes, ‘socialization and the structure of opportunity...become translated into expectations about work, career choice and, ultimately, work behaviour’. This career choice has a structure. According to Finkelstein (1984 as cited in Lindholm 2004: 605):

The vocational decision-making process for prospective faculty consists of two relatively independent decisions: (a) choice of disciplinary field and (b) choice of an academic career versus any other non-academic career path that one could pursue with the same disciplinary background and training.

Lindholm’s (2004: 613) findings show that the second component of this structure usually leads the academic career development – as the majority of academics ‘recognise the congruence between their personal needs and preferences and the characteristics of academic work environments even before they had a sense of which specific disciplinary field they wanted to pursue’. Operating with Super’s self-concept theory, Lindholm (2004: 624) stresses ‘a stable pattern’ of academic motivation, ‘characterised by early and permanent career decisions’.

There are several ways through which a career-seeking academic can be motivated throughout his/her life. In the early stages, motivation may work as the ‘parent identification factor’, either positive or negative – when the person associates or dissociates himself with the parents while making a career choice (Super et al. 1965). According to Finkelstein (1984 as cited in Lindholm 2004: 605-6), ‘professors come from families that stress the value of intellectual pursuits and academic achievement...and early childhood experiences...appear to influence individuals’ decisions to become professors’. In academic life positive parent identification may lead to academic dynasticism in the direct meaning of the word. And here Lindholm (2004: 614) recognises the co-called ‘academic brats’, entirely motivated during ‘regular family dinner conversations’.

Later college socialization may largely promote further motivation, and later in life, the motivation is frequently dependent on professional membership or networking (Baldwin & Blackburn 1981; Bazeley 2003; Lindholm 2004):

The period of [college and post-college] training typically ensures socialization into the academic profession and to the culture and style of the particular discipline...and the importance to develop associations with distinguished researchers and to establish good scholarly habits (Bazeley 2003: 257).

Thinking about academic networking as a source of the ‘social organization’ and ‘social production’ of academic work, Clark (1986: 30) sees three aspects in its ‘socio-genic foundations’: the ‘structural diversity and complexity’ of academic environments; academics’ ‘adaptation to their environment’; and the ‘role of symbolic aspect of the environment’ in negotiating academic behaviour. Later in this chapter, I will explain how Bourdieu (1988) views this socio-genicism of academic motivation through the prism of academic games and the symbolism of academic identities, comprising and deriving from the structural complexity of academic relations.

In an effort to understand the nature of these relations, scholars refer to the motivation attracting factors, generally defined as the ‘allure of University work environment’ (Lindholm 2004: 612) – the allure of the ‘academic paradise’ (Clark 1986; Geertz 1983; Weiland 1994; 1995). Among ‘the most compelling attractors to academic work’ are ‘challenge’ [or academic buccaneering], ‘freedom’ or ‘the discretionary time built into the academic profession’ and ‘the inherent [psychological] “fit” between academics and their jobs’ (Lindholm 2004: 606-22).⁶ Resonating with views of Clark (1986), Becher and Trowler (2001) and Bourdieu (1988), Lindholm (2004) further notes that the particulars of the impact of these factors upon academic career have been substantially under-examined:

The inherent complexity of career decision-making processes, coupled with the paucity of empirical research on academic career development makes it difficult to draw meaningful conclusions about the interplay between individual and environmental factors in shaping academic career choice (Lindholm 2004: 604).

As we can see, this complexity, deriving from the creative nature of the academic career, makes its progression from stage to stage highly individualised.

⁶ See Clark (1986), Geertz (1983) and Weiland (1994; 1995).

Unfortunately, the developmental approach, with its focus on specific stages, leads to simplistic and disintegrated findings when applied to academic careers. According to Clark (1986: 30), 'research is unable to find agreement between faculty's perception of their career development and the career stages described in the professional literature'. Referring to the 1968 research by Hall and Nougaim, Clark further notes that 'chronological age roughly corresponds to the career development stages identified by Donald Super'. In the opinion of Weiland (1994; 1995), it happens because Super's approach denies the normalcy of improvisation, which is unavoidable in academic life.

Even the common concept of '(mid)career crisis' – conventionally associated with the maintenance stage and the so-called middle age - does not precisely fit such theories. This is because career crisis actually occurs more than once, leading to the obscurity in our understanding of how it may affect progression from stage to stage besides causing a range of negative attitudes (Baldwin & Blackburn 1981).⁷ The mid-career period itself is also recognised as highly individual and therefore, contradicting the logic of linear progression. That is why the most productive understanding of academic life can be achieved from the angle of the Whole Life Approach to career development, using the language of sociology and anthropology rather than developmental psychology (Weiland 1995). As concluded by Clark (1986: 24), 'An expanded sociological perspective is strongly needed'. Thus social anthropologists understand career motivation as one's search for identity through one's career as a life journey – the journey toward the 'academic paradise' (broadly imagined as better working conditions) – the route that can be analyzed through a variety of categories.

Tracing its highly abstract and metaphorical origin – the Latin *carraria*, meaning "by road" - Arthur and Lawrence (1984: 1) define *career* as 'a person's course or progress through life - or through a distinct portion of life'. The intrinsically 'figurative imagery' around the notion of career frequently makes it the object of

⁷ Among the manifestations of academic career crisis scholars observe 'feeling off-time...out of synch...professionally delayed' (Clark 1986: 31); 'the mid-life experience of career doubt'; a 'standstill feel' among academics; and 'occupational disengagement of "stuck" professionals', particularly at the 'uncreative maintenance stage' (Baldwin & Blackburn 1981: 606-11).

sociological and anthropological enquiry (op cit). I understand the academic career from the socio-anthropological vantage point of Bateson (1989), who conceptualises career through its bonds to a person's entire life and brings in the notion of 'career as life'. That is why looking at academic career, we should primarily think not of how the person progresses from stage to stage but what anthropological and metaphorical configurations his/her trajectory may have and how this trajectory may impact upon identity.

Complexities of academic life

The wrinkled sea beneath him crawls;
He watches from his mountain walls,
And like a *thunderbolt* he falls.
(Lord Alfred Tennyson, *Eagle*)

The *meek* will inherit the University
(Mueller 2004: 20).

Individuality and membership

There are two universally basic traits that distinguish the academy from other social settings, regardless of time and space. Researchers point to the intrinsically and universally paradoxical nature of academic life in terms of the 'individuality versus networking' dichotomy. Weiland (1995: 89) particularly stresses these two essential features, which make academic biographies extremely problematic and under-examined. In summary, he says that the trajectories of academic people are 'prized for autonomy' or 'academic individuality' – however, also for 'membership' or 'colleagueship'. In his opinion, an academic individual and an academic networker are the roles not easily balanced even in the latest, globalised, context. By observing 'the apparent coexistence of radical chic [individuality] with entrenched conservatism', he nevertheless acknowledges membership as a more traditional and, therefore, more trustworthy, force of shaping academic identities (Weiland 1995: 97).

Struggling through and/or adjusting to such processes, academics have to negotiate their identities and to somehow balance their intrinsically conflicting individuality and membership. Bourdieu (1988) sees this clash through the prism of

'academic capital' accumulation. His idea of 'academic capital' can be understood as the ability to exercise both expert power (or the individual radical chic) and reward power (or the leading position in the academic membership) – the skill highly desired by the majority of academics. Access to this capital leads us to acknowledge the primacy of the social context, associated with membership, networking, tribalism, or culture in academic settings (Alvesson 1993). Aiming at intellectual chic (or individuality), academics still work in a concrete academic institution rather than in a politics-free vacuum. That is why University cultures are often described by sociologists in terms of 'academic tribalism' and 'networks of patronage':

The flow of cultural currents into universities from their environment can have considerable influence on academic practices and attitudes. These currents include the norms, values and recurrent practices associated with, for example, "great Culture" or the characteristic national culture and those associated with external structural features such as gender, ethnicity, social class. Individuals entering new organizational settings inevitably import cultural patterns deriving from the wider environment and do not lose them simply because of the power of disciplinary epistemology (Becher and Trowler 2001: 23).

According to Becher and Trowler, 'the distinct cultures within academic communities' emerge in this connection as 'academic tribes' undergoing the influence of such 'structural factors' as 'the patterns of educational ideologies found in any given university and the unique pre-existing cultural configuration present within universities'. The tribalism is associated with a specific, fixed hierarchy, or order, as 'any university institutional context has its own particular 'institutional logic', including a specific 'regime' (Becher & Trowler 2001: 56). Evidently, the term 'regime' accompanies a large variety of 'culture' definitions.

In reference to academic capital accumulation as the source of academic power, Bourdieu (1988: 87) says:

Because of the fact that accumulation of academic capital takes up time (the capital held is closely linked with age), the distances in this space are measured in time, in temporal gaps, in age differences...Reproduction of the hierarchy supposes a respect for distances, that is respect for the order of succession...Passing through the stages of assistant lecturer, doctoral thesis, promotion from assistant lecturer to lecturer and then a chair – this is an *ideal career*

trajectory - with each of the major stages of this itinerary an obstacle race and a competitive examination. This is the conflict between the personally internalised structures of expectation (waiting) and the objective structures of likely trajectories.

In Bourdieu's opinion, academic mobility is a journey toward academic capital accumulation. In more technical terms, the academic individual's promotion – the visible element, or the formal aspect, of his mobility – eloquently testifies to and mirrors the reproduction of hierarchy, or the reproduction of career inequality. At the same time, the hierarchy is constantly reproduced through the establishment of academic gates or barriers, which constantly impede promotion. Relevant literature frequently uses the 'pyramid' metaphor to explain the hardware (the administrative structure) of academic regimes. As Bourdieu (1988: 50) remarks, 'The organizational ladder [of academia] is like a pyramid with a very sharp pinnacle and a very wide base'. The higher the level of your destination, the narrower the gates.

Thus the Odyssey toward academic power is a painful process, often obstructed by biological time – a factor causing frustration in ambitious young academics. To put it simply, there is an academic hierarchy; there are academic gates through which it is reproduced; and there is a specific conduct code for passing through the gates. Many studies show that in practice, everyone recognises the existence of these gates - even without being given specific instruction in academic conduct (Becher and Trowler 2001; Bourdieu 1988; Corra and Willer 2002; Merton 1973; Mulkay 1997). For example, the 'ideal career trajectory' observed by Bourdieu (1988: 83) reflects the image of coming through the gates – the route for which the majority of University graduates are theoretically prepared. What most 'unsuccessful' academics do not see clearly are the specific rules of conduct for passing through such gates. The conflict between their expectations and the academic reality demonstrates that recognising these gates, many people do not understand the *de facto* criteria of passing through them because 'the ascription of status [the ultimate target of academic tribal games] is a delicate and complex business' (Bourdieu 1988: 83). It often takes a considerable amount of the precious biological time to grasp the implicit details of academic conduct before a person can move forward. Being on the waiting list does not really mean that your position will improve. What is more important in this journey along the waiting list – the mastery

of disciplinary expertise or the mastery of the tribal rules of conduct? In reference to the conflict between 'scientific/intellectual competence' and 'social/political competence', Jenkins (1992: 121) suggests that unfortunately, 'intellectual and scientific criteria come a poor second...to the implicit criteria of acceptability (social competence – whether or not someone's "face fits") in academic recruitment'. However, Bourdieu (1988) himself leaves this provocative question open for further in-depth research yet explicitly leads us to think about this acceptability as an outcome of academic gambling.

The impact of academic tribalism upon academic behaviour and academic career progression can be also understood as the effect of a game. Bourdieu (1988) understands academic life as a process of seeking academic power – that is, as a 'game' for 'academic capital'. He notices that academics 'compete' and gamble for capital' (including the 'symbolic capital' of 'prestige, status and authority'), in order 'to improve their place within a field' – that is, within their institutional environment that 'produces and authorises certain discourses' (Webb et al. 2002: x).⁸ In other words, if the University is considered a knowledge industry, it can be looked at through the prism of the game for ideological leadership (Bourdieu: 1988).

Research frequently uses the idea of unfair sport in reference to the academic career – the image of a game that is discriminatory and elitist. 'The outcome of this constant exercise of discriminative judgment is the creation of elites and the marking down of those who are not among the front-runners...A small elite of scientists enjoy a disproportionate share of grant resources and peer recognition' (Bourdieu 1988: 83). Merton (1973) and Mulkay (1997) also interpret academic elitism as true mobility accessible to a very small number of scientists at the centre of the information network. The chosen *crème de la crème* within the tribal nucleus may enjoy various forms of academic resources and scholarly recognition as an outcome of their unrestricted mobility. Mulkay (op cit) particularly looks at the academic *haut monde* through the lenses of cumulative advantage and defines this phenomenon as

⁸ Bourdieu (2000) uses the concept of 'cultural field', which he defines as 'a series of institutions, rules, rituals, conventions, categories, designations and opportunities which constitute an objective hierarchy, and which produce and authorise certain discourses and activities...a field also constituted by, or out of, the conflict' about the distribution of the capital (Webb et al. 2002: x).

'a self-reinforcing elite structure'. Below is how Bourdieu (1988: 83) explains this process:

The more eminent the scientist becomes, the more visible he appears to his colleagues and the greater the credit he received for his contributions. Once you earn a name for yourself, it acts as a magnet: you get invitations to join societies, give papers and take up offices. Academics who are productive in their early careers are likely to remain so, while those who are not are unlikely to become so: the evidence that success breeds success spans the disciplines.

In the course of gaming, or gambling, the tribal academic culture imposes certain '*de jure* rules of conduct', says Bourdieu (1988: 50). In his opinion, 'a career-minded academic must know "the more Machiavellian rules of conduct" that exist *de facto* within any academic community'. The 'rules of academic conduct', or 'the feel for the game', become an important concept in our understanding of academic mobility and the reproduction of academic hierarchy. Because knowledge is essential in this context, a 'player' who is to pass through the gates seeks a 'network rich in information'. Here is Bourdieu's (1988) precise answer to the question about what an academic tribe actually is. An academic tribe is a 'network rich in information' chief among which are the details of the appropriate rules of localised academic conduct. The academic tribe provides its members with what Ball and Vincent (1998: 380) call 'hot knowledge' or 'grapevine knowledge', which is 'seen as more reliable than other, official, sources of information'.⁹ In contrast with open-access 'cold knowledge', 'grapevine knowledge' is transmitted through such channels as 'friends, neighbours and relatives', thus becoming part of the 'patronage' network (Ball & Vincent 1998: 380).

Especially in its post-modern course, academic life is marked with powerful 'patronage systems', in which gate-keeping is a cornerstone, observe Corra and Willer (2002). The latter phenomenon often camouflages itself as the former. Because 'patronage' is a frequent euphemism for 'gate-keeping', it becomes extremely difficult to break this binding relationship. Besides, a powerful person 'may exercise a considerable degree of charismatic authority', as observed by Nelson

⁹ Ball and Vincent (1998: 380) introduce the concept of 'hot knowledge' (the knowledge from friends, neighbours and relatives) in contrast with 'cold knowledge' (or official knowledge).

and Lambert (2001: 87). Thus the patron's gate-keeping duties include finding jobs for dependents, relatives and friends - with the "favours" from the patron to be paid for by "gifts". The studies also point to the universally 'personalistic and unequal' nature of patronage systems. In this connection, Bourdieu (1988: 92) further clarifies the fact that the departmental/institutional patronage system in academia is actually represented through two basic membership groups: the 'inner circle' of approximately six to twelve people (marked with 'more affinity' to the patron and 'tighter liaisons' between the academic gamers) and the 'outer circle' of around 100-400 people of the patron's professional acquaintance.

As Bourdieu (1988) notes, there are 'one or two people' who build 'clusters' or 'ancestral spirits'. Here research points to the mythical 'analogy with a family, which should "protect" its members...and if you go outside [with your ambitions or complaints]...you are soon labelled a "bad lot"' (Bailey 1977: 27). It can be logically assumed from this statement that the academics progressing in such conditions think about the intercollegiate relations in terms of dynasticism or *cosa nostra*. Mueller (2004: 1-2) calls this phenomenon 'administrative mobbing' and relates to 'a variety of traps' the 'academic mob can spring to induce a "difficult professor" to depart'. Thus gate-keeping, associated with monopoly (or the absolute power) of the patron, is used for his/her personal wealth through the exchange network relationship. Membership in these networks is elitist and unequal, with the privilege of humiliation for ascendants.

On a conclusive note, Bailey (1977), Bourdieu (1988) and Mueller (2004) stress that gate-keeping is omni-present and fundamental in academic life because visually it takes various camouflaging forms of the academic godfather-hood and, therefore, attracts more and more people to pass through while respecting the pass code. Thus it is extremely difficult in academic life to be an individual and a member to an equal extent. In most cases, people make a choice between these two categories – a choice that might differ throughout the academic life course.

Academic identities

Tribalism, with its gates and games supplanting individuality, seems omni-present in the academic world. Bourdieu (1988) analyses tribalism and culture

referring to the French academy as an illustrative case. 'Many of the observations he makes, however, are likely to prove very familiar to the British or American academic reader. Herein lies its generality' (Jenkins 1992: 119). Thus a comparative analysis of academic inequalities shows that tribalism, elitism and abuse of power, with the consequent impact upon academic lives and identities, are universal phenomena, in terms of both space and time. As Altbach (2002: 12) remarks, 'Universities everywhere are bureaucratic institutions'. This means that 'virtually all of the world's academic systems are shaped like a pyramid, with a small, elite sector at the top, and a large, relatively unselective middle (2006: 49). For example, academic freedom, a target of such tribal attacks, remains 'far from secure in many parts of the world' (2004: 10). Altbach (2007: 1) illustrates his statement with the cases of the former Soviet republics, which show 'disastrous...signs of backsliding'. Rayner's (1997: 199) comparative study reveals a cross-cultural pattern of the power abuse in British, Swedish and Norwegian academic settings; whereas Jefferson (2007) points to the frequent 'inappropriateness in [academic] conduct' from such abusive practices in Canadian higher education and recognises the difficulties of their prevention. Thus academic membership and self-determination remain the most essential features of academic life across a variety of contexts.

A combination of these features determines a career trajectory – that is, through what events the academic life will pass. It also determines career identity. In academic life, career development is inseparable from career identity. Here we see two other crucial concepts around academic career – progression and self-identification. Mobility and identity emerge as other categories important for our understanding of academic life. Anthropologically, career can be understood as a journey throughout life whose purpose is to figure out the meaning of life. As observed by Arthur and Lawrence (1984: 1), the basic theme that stands out in all career definitions is the idea of giving 'meaning to life through work' because work holds a large and consistent share in life:

People are engaged in some consistent occupational activity that has personal consequences, such as 'remarkable incidents', progress', or 'advancement'. These themes are strongly associated with the notions of identity ('I am what I do') and of vocation ('My life is my work'). Historically these two themes have been necessarily inter-

woven. Life has been work for many people...and people keep asking themselves, 'Is this job meaningful to me?'

The ideas of mobility and identity become inseparable in the understanding of life experiences. In this connection, London (1983: 621) looks at the interplay between mobility and identity by introducing the concept of 'career identity', which shows 'how central one's career is to one's identity'. As he further explains,

Career identity consists of two sub-domains: work involvement and desire for upward mobility. Individuals who are high on career identity are likely to find career satisfaction to be more important than satisfaction from other areas of life. The upward mobility sub-domain includes the needs for advancement, recognition, dominance, and money (op cit).

London's conception leads to the question of how these two elements intermingle with each other within academic identities. From the socio-anthropological angle, the academic career actually represents an interesting case of the strong relationship between mobility and identity. The earlier described tribal membership determines whether the person has power and mobility and, consequently in what terms he/she reflects on his identity.

There are several ways to understand academic identities with regard to their dependence on the social context and individual choice. In very general terms, all academic identities can be explained from the angle of the dilemma of academic morale versus economic security. What choices academics are prone to make at difficult times shows to what extent they may behave in intellectual or anti-intellectual way. Research shows that academic identities can be at times both intellectual and anti-intellectual.

Gross (2002: 52) defines an 'intellectual' as 'an individual specialised in the production of scientific ideas'. Williams distinguishes between 'professionals with limited interests' and 'intellectuals with wider interests' (cited in Todorov et al. 1997: 1123). According to Todorov et al. (op cit), not every academic is an intellectual and academics can be divided into two categories: experts and intellectuals. The former 'know facts' whereas the latter 'discuss values' (op cit: 1122). 'What it means to be intellectual depends on where you are situated in space and time' (op cit).

Gross (2002: 52) asks, 'What social factors influence intellectuals' decisions to affiliate with one intellectual tradition over another?' He further pinpoints two contradictory and, at the same time, complimentary forces that stimulate intellectual choice: the quest for status within the intellectual field and intellectual self-concept. Intellectual choice is based on the pursuit of intellectual status. According to this view, thinkers situated in modern intellectual fields seek the recognition, esteem, and trust of their colleagues. A thinker's desire for status in an institutional environment or disciplinary field may be so strong that it influences the ideas he or she comes to hold. However, Gross (2002: 53) adds that there is no 'overarching theory of intellectual life centred around this objective'. The 'intellectual self-concept', accentuated by Gross (op cit) brings in the importance of values and commitments. Responding to Bourdieu's (1988) argument about the 'relative independence of intellectuals from the realms of economic or political power' in the current context, Gross (2002: 54) remarks, 'The autonomy of intellectual judgment is never complete'.

Said (1994) stresses the issue of loyalty to the authorities. Even if the intellectual seems to be above politics, this is a mirage rather than reality (op cit). When he places himself above political games, it is the flexible nature of the political environment that tolerates or welcomes such placement at this particular moment due to the political elite's stakes - living '*with* the land' rather than '*on* it' (Said 2001). In this connection, Todorov and colleagues (2002: 1122) observe that intellectual betrayal (which is a product of the socio-political mission, by the way) has a rich history (until recently) of 'engagement in the defence of anti-democratic political and moral ideals'.

Intellectual life is often said to go side by side with anti-intellectualism – whether it is a modern University or the global academy. According to Dewey (1910: 478, anti-intellectualism is a 'form of pragmatism...insisting upon the presence of non-rational factors in the knowledge structure'. This definition can be illustrated by the Soviet politics of 'lysenkoism', whose target was to achieve quick results by means of scientific fraud (Soyfer 2001). It can be also exemplified by the 'oligopolistic' tendency of the global market to satisfy the middle-level consumer (Spybey 1996). In the opinion of Hofstadter (1963: ix), anti-intellectualism is 'a

disposition constantly to minimise the importance' of intellectual life. And this disruption has been observed in both modern and post-modern Universities.

As early as in 1954 Miller defined anti-intellectualism as a widespread phenomenon of 'intellectual debasement' or the 'debasement of [the] intellectual' (op cit: 123). In his opinion, anti-intellectualism is a political trend as it has its own organization, 'agitators' and 'everyday support'. Anti-intellectualism is organised through the ideologies of both 'communism and liberalism' and agitated through television and comic strips, which form the anti-intellectual culture. Westheimer (2002: 60) observes that the 'creeping corporate climate of some university departments can easily lead to the substitution of bureaucratic allegiance for scholarly inquiry as the cornerstone of academic life'. As seen from these two brief analyses, anti-intellectualism becomes an unavoidable outcome of economic globalization with its neo-liberal practices and of the overall mass consumption culture.

In the majority of cases, either academic intellectualism or anti-intellectualism reveals itself within a specific context – that of the person's academic tribe. The way an academic passes through certain gates determines and depends on what role he plays in his academic tribe. Through the prism of academic role-playing, there are more specific types of academic identities, including those revolving around both intellectualism and anti-intellectualism.

As I have already mentioned, the earlier described reproduction of academic hierarchy – particularly, through academic gate-keeping – makes it obvious that academic career progression is closely linked to the construction of academic identities. In other words, how people progress and what meanings they find in such experiences determine who they are professionally and also who they are in terms of inter-personal relations. Resonating with the metaphor of academic life as a game, Bailey (1977: 89) remarks that academics are akin to 'actors' and that is why they care a lot about their 'reputations of performance' or their own public image. Thus he sees academic identities as related to 'actors and reputations'. Though the question of academic career identity is frequently touched upon in literatures, there is no systematic opinion on all possible identities that emerge in the milieu of academic tribalism.

I have identified five parameters that help to distinguish between different professional identities in academic life: (1) exercise of power; (2) route to power and through the academic gates; (3) scholarly reputation together with control over the knowledge production; (4) age and experience; and (5) personal attachment to the academy.

In terms of the exercise of power, academics can be functionally viewed as gate-keepers ('professional feuds', 'patrons', or 'fee collectors') versus 'clients'/'passers' (Corra and Willer 2002; Husen 1980). In the opinion of Bourdieu, this dichotomy (as well as the following one) is a direct outcome of the reproduction of hierarchy:

The role of "gatekeeper" – the person that determines who is allowed into a particular community and who remains excluded – is a significant one in terms of the development of knowledge fields. Generally the *stars* of a particular discipline occupy the main gate-keeping roles. By their acts as gatekeepers and evaluators, they determine what work is considered good and what is unimportant (1988: 85).

When seeking power and participating in the game, academic staff are clearly categorised by Bourdieu (1988: 87) into '*celeritas*' (or 'corner cutters') and '*gravitas*' (or 'easy goers'):

It is this very order which threatens the *celeritas* of those who want to "cut corners" (for example, by importing into the university field properties or powers acquired on other terrains), as against *gravitas*, the healthy slowness that people like to feel in itself a guarantee of reliability and which is really unconditional respect for the fundamental principles of the established order.

The *celerita-gravita* conflict to a certain extent reflects the disciplinary nature of the academic career trajectory. In general, researchers agree that there is no single path to an academic career, though recognising the disciplinary differences evident in the sequencing of steps. Scholars of academic careers sometimes link the ideas of progression and biological time and lead us to think that, in many cases, the discipline-imposed age requirements covertly impact upon academic identities. As Bazeley (2003: 271) observes, 'the tendency to speak of "young" rather than "new" academics suggests the application of an implicit age-related criterion'. According to

Becher and Trowler (2001), the discipline-related 'age' inevitably causes anxiety among hard scientists. In the opinion of Bazeley (op cit: 261), there is wide variation between, for example, the pure scientist who completes doctoral studies, gains postdoctoral research experience as a member of a team, and who then steps onto the ladder of an academic career – I would call him the academic hurricane or the academic thunderbolt - and a social science or elementary school teacher with many years of professional experience and quite possibly also many years of academic teaching, who then undertakes PhD candidature and endeavours to build a research profile (the cocoon academic).

Returning to Bourdieu's (1988; 2000) terminology, here he obviously emphasises the principle of pioneering scholarly terrains as essential for discussing identities. Bourdieu's (1988) dichotomy of '*celerita* academics' versus '*gravita* academics' is perhaps the most distinct and understandable identity division because it is mostly based on the factual information about the obstacles a person had to overcome and the investments he/she had to make while en-route to a powerful position.

In terms of attachment to academia, or professional patriotism, Bailey (1977: 40-47) distinguishes between four distinct identity types. Thus he speaks about 'withdrawn' academics – or '*sanyasi*' academics – who entirely live in the world of their scientific domains, or in the Temple of Science. At the same time, the academic community is comprised of the so-called 'predators' and 'plunderers'. They are talented academics who, living in the Temple of Science, 'extract resources from the outside world without giving anything in return'. There are also 'committed' academics, who switch from the Temple of Science to public service and administration and often 'prostitute' themselves in the conditions of the market. Finally, the most complex type is 'adaptors'. Bailey understands the academic 'adaptor' as 'a loose combination of roles one-three held together by the pragmatic rule: only what which is practical is worthy of time and effort'.

Other researchers generally agree with this understanding of academic identities. However, they add their own interpretation to this conception. Thus in reference to Bailey's 'withdrawn' academics, Husen (1980) speaks about such identities as 'academics married to higher education' and 'professors as lifelong

learners' in their opposition to 'average academics' and academic prisoners (those who find themselves in 'ordeal of competing for a position'). As for the 'adaptor' category, Bourdieu (2000: 142-3) would probably call these people 'misrecognisers'. In his opinion, adaptation is often based on 'misrecognition' as a 'form of forgetting' certain events. By 'misrecognising' symbolic violence, adaptors largely contribute to the reproduction of hierarchy.

There are several unclear points in all these identity studies. For example, who is the 'average academic'? What element is supposed to prevail in the understanding of this role – reputation or power? The literatures do not clarify either what scholarly reputation, or academic stardom, means. For example, when Bourdieu (1988: 84) writes about many examples of 'academic pygmies turning into giants', does he mean the development of scholarly expertise, the sudden boost of talent, the accumulation power, or all these things together? He himself explains the difficulties of understanding this concept as time-dependent, 'True eminence is hard to judge except retrospectively' (op cit). This example of the academic 'pygmy-giant' metamorphosis also proves that the academic role-playing is an active process. Joining an academic tribe, living according to its rules, revealing individuality, resisting the tribal power and exercising one's own power, academic people constantly re-assess their goals. Academic games and gates make people re-invent themselves. Thus an essential feature of academic life is arguably a constant re-invention of identity. That is probably what makes academic life very robust under environmental change, including globalization.

Globalization and the changing context of academic work

Addressing the dynamics of post-modern life, Sennett (1998) focuses on the uncontrollability of the 'runaway world', envisioned by Giddens (2000). According to the earlier mentioned sceptics, globalization – with its turbo-economics and marketization – adds a degree of uncomfortable novelty, fragmentation and experimentation to any career. Thus globalization frequently disrupts linear progression and linear time management and adds complexity to the classic career progression from stage to stage (Sennett op cit). Globalization changes familiar

career patterns and causes identity crisis (Huisman et al. 2002; Sennett op cit). In this connection, Sennett (op cit) refers to the 'drifting' rather than coordinated nature of post-modern career trajectories. Instead, globalization creates more flexibility and less conventional division into stages. Career development in the globalizing world becomes Janus-faced, offering both the benefit of flexibility and the disadvantage of emotional stress. That is why studies of the post-modern career may not give easy answers, which is especially evident in academic lives.

The globalization of post-industrial society is undoubtedly transforming the environment of higher education throughout the world, simultaneously compressing and expanding its parameters and thus turning it into what Castells would call a 'global casino' (1998: 342), whose 'far-flung' branches are bound together by electronic means (Allakhverdov 1996: 594). The 'global university' – an outcome of this 'casino' effect – is based on the functional definition of the academy – that related to its new mission in post-modernity. In modernity, the University fulfilled the socio-political function in three distinct directions: nationalization, democratization and public service. As observed by Readings (1995) and Scott (2006), the post-modern or global University is expected to promote the corporate function or the function of internationalization to give a new framework to past directions. An argument is that academics become part of both the knowledge economy and academic capitalist production. The term 'academic capitalism' (Slaughter & Lesley 1997), whose semantics accentuate the encroachment of the profit motive into the academy, often generically defines the whole range of metamorphoses occurring in post-industrial higher education, as well as its highly competitive and contradictory environment under the impact of globalization.¹⁰

Looking back to von Humboldt and the humanistic heritage he left, the following image of a classic modern University comes to life. The model of modern university is associated with 'thick' medieval universities (Scott 2006: 31), which had three missions, specifically: as nationalization (or service and loyalty of the academic individual to the nation-state); democratization (the reciprocal function of service to the academic individual of the nation-state); and public service (or service of the academic individual to the community) (op cit: 1).

¹⁰ For more information on academic capitalism and related terminology, see Chart 1.

Scholars remark that the first function conveyed the idea of preserving the national culture, which ought to exist in isolation or vacuum from the rest of the world (Dyer 1889; Rice 1970; Rothblatt 1997; Scott 2006). Despite the early attempts to globalise the modern University in Europe through the administrative principles of religious networking, the 'socio-political mission of nationalization' still prevailed as something that distinguished academic modernity from post-modernity (Readings 1996).

The modern University operated through Mode 1 knowledge production, according to which knowledge was produced within the University and for intellectual and political elites (Delanty 2001; Jacob & Hellstrom 2000). As a tribute to late humanism, this mode of knowledge was based on the equally important status of teaching and research. In this milieu, 'the university started as a single community – a community of masters and students' (Moran 1968: 147). This community was said to have 'a soul in the sense of a central animating principle' due to the feeling of 'chosenness' or affiliation with a high culture among academic people (Moran 1968: 147). Flexner, cited in Moran (1968: 147), thinks of the modern University as an 'organism, whose parts and the whole are in-extrinsically bound together'. This is what the modern University used to be, at least, discursively.

Its classic examples could be observed throughout the world later in the twentieth century, as illustrated by universities of the Soviet regime. The twentieth-century totalitarian governments used Universities 'to attempt a rapid change in the social structure of society, to increase the growth of industrial technological proficiency, and to control scholarship for propagandistic purposes' (Domonkos 1977: 237). Domonkos further explains that since those universities were controlled by the new nation-state, the training role for the expanding governing elite was greatly intensified. According to Readings (1996: 4-11), this 'socio-political mission' takes place within the university as 'an ideological arm of the state'. In other words, 'The state protects the action of the University; the University safeguards the thought of the state' (op cit: 69). Because there is no fixed and predicted time for globalization, different societies globalise their higher education at a different pace. This explains why there still exist classic modern Universities throughout the globalizing world.

Slaughter and Leslie (1997) argue that to facilitate the global change, convergent policies are designed in the Anglophone countries to promote organizational restructuring and other adjustments to academic capitalism. Governments reduce funding to Universities, thus pressing them to alter their curricula, research and organizational development in a way that 'intersects' with the market (Deem & Johnson 2003). Slaughter and Leslie (1997) pinpoint a shift worldwide from 'basic' or 'curiosity-driven' research to 'targeted' or commercial' or 'strategic' research, which is strongly linked to the post-industrial corporate sector.

The shift towards marketization takes place because the academic quest for new fiscal resources parallels the corporate claim for innovative intellectual products (Bok 2003; Slaughter & Leslie 1997; Smolentseva 2003). Desperately searching for funds, the academy appeals to affluent donors, who generously sponsor the avant-garde knowledge. Delanty (2001: 107) remarks that 'deans and department heads... resemble managers', while Castells (1998: 345) categorises them as 'informational producers'.

Recent changes in academic work include such components as massification, resource constraint and audit culture, as observed by Deem (2001). She further comments upon the detrimental effects of these phenomena, explaining that massification impairs the intercourse between professors and their students, loosens the teaching/research interconnection, aggravates the decline of the prestige of academic profession and damages the moral principles of the academy. Constrained resources contribute to salary reduction and the deterioration of employment conditions. The spread of the audit culture feeds such trends as 'deprofessionalization', 'proletarianization' and 'routinisation' of academic work (Bok 2003; Deem 2001; Slaughter & Leslie 1997; Smolentseva 2003).

A manifestation of this academic proletarianization is a global tendency to make use of a cheap labour force, including maquiladora workers (Castells 1998). The basic attributes of such employment are low payment and heavy and inflexible schedules. Fernandez-Kelly (1995) states that such employees are forced to work up to ten hours per day, including night shifts. In my opinion, maquiladorship or the 'maquiladora syndrome' (Ellingstad 1997: 7) has become a widespread phenomenon

even outside the production sector in the Third World. Russian academics in Russia, including my former colleagues from the Ryazan State Pedagogical University, are academic maquiladora workers. Working in four or five places and participating in trans-national partnership projects, they are still paid almost nothing compared with what is paid to those who work in the West. The West sponsors many transnational projects for Russian science.¹¹

Thus a market-driven capitalism is pervading the university, shaping it in 'the image of techno-science' (Delanty 2001: 157), which is in sharp contrast with the Humboldtian ideas of Humanism. In reference to the knowledge mode transition, Delanty (op cit: 45-6) sees this clash between the elite/'bourgeois' knowledge (produced in modern Universities) and the knowledge for mass consumption (produced in global Universities) as a substitution of the 'knowledge dissemination' by the 'spectre of the marketization of knowledge'. In the opinion of Featherstone (1988: 209), the high culture elitism of knowledge 'requires discipline and asceticism, which can be only acquired by the professional intellectual through years of withdrawal from everyday realities'. This intellectual mode was preserved in modern universities. It can be assumed from Featherstone's argument that intellectuals' participation in entrepreneurial activities, as dictated by turbo capitalism, inevitably destroys the ecology of absolute (elite) knowledge. Knowledge massification leads to 'McUniversities' (Ritzer 1996: 185) and CocaColleges. These 'cathedrals of consumption' target the middle line in excellence criteria, as dictated by the oligopolistic market (op cit). As Delanty (2001: 5) remarks, for many academics, 'The University has collapsed into a bureaucratic enterprise, which is bereft of moral purpose'.

Academic mobility

As we can see, the overall impact of the global change upon academic life is very complex. Academic careers are even more complicated by the requirement of international contact, leading to the formation of the so-called cosmopolitan academy.

¹¹ For more detailed information on research grants in Russia, see British Council Russia (n.d.) and CRDF Immediate Release (2005).

Academic cosmopolitanism is understood by Altbach (2004: 3) as a direct outcome of internationalization, which is seen as a local and specific response to the globalization of higher education.¹² In his opinion, internationalization shows how globalization, with its 'broad economic, technological, and scientific trends', is localised within a particular higher education segment:

Internationalization includes specific policies and programs undertaken by governments, academic systems and institutions, and even individual departments to cope with or exploit globalization...Academic systems and institutions may accommodate these [global] developments in different ways (Altbach 2004: 3).

Internationalization, which literally means 'service to the body of nation-states', is associated with international networking and global expansion (Scott 2006: 31). It is 'potentially a new social mission that arrests the transformation of higher education into another knowledge industry' (Scott 2006: 31).

Internationalization is associated with a particular University and its "glocalization".¹³ Internationalization of higher education may be recognised as generally synonymous with trans-nationalism. As I understand it, the former emerges as the goal and the outcome of the latter. In other words, to promote internationalization means to provide educational services to several nation-states through trans-nationalism or international networking. The concept of trans-nationalism in higher education conveys all trans-national activities in which globalised, or internationalised, Universities are involved. Referring to these 'supra-national and trans-national agency activities', Ozga (2005: 208) uses the term 'travelling educational policies'.

There are such basic forms of trans-nationalism in higher education – or such basic forms of the travelling policy – as (a) trans-national educational initiatives (based on the idea of a convergent policy within a trans-national corporation (TNC))

¹² In this connection, Ozga (2005: 208) conceptualizes globalization as broadly 'shaping education policy and driving the modernization agenda' – in particular, tightening the bonds between the economy and education'.

¹³ Writing about globalization and its manifestations in specific localities, Spybey (1996: 21) uses the term "glocalize", borrowed from Japanese marketing practice. It means 'global localization' or 'the global in conjunction with the local' (op cit).

and (b) trans-national migration through international academic networks.¹⁴ The so-called TNC effect may emerge as convergent policies on research between different countries (Agalianos 2006; Lohmann 2006) or as inter-disciplinary research efforts, with 'new links between the sciences' (Delanty 2001: 8). The latter are fraught with the effect of 'full-scale fusion' (Scholte 1997: 437), thus challenging the idea of the Humboldtian University (Delanty 2001; Jacob & Hellstrom 2000). In fact, 'traditional universities seem likely to be threatened by global mega-Universities like the University of Phoenix (USA) and the Open University (UK)' (Becher & Trowler 2001: 3).

The TNC effect can be also observed in multiple 'branched-out programmes' promoted by the EU Commission and national governments, in collaboration with business companies, on University campuses (Lohmann 2006: 22). For example, various organizations and treaties actively promote the internationalization mission of universities among their member states, including the European Union, Association of Southeast Asian Nations, North American Free Trade Agreement and Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. The European Union is creating their European Research Area, connected internationally and even beyond the European Union, with the aim of enabling the European Union by 2010 to become the world's most competitive and dynamic knowledge economy. For example, *Universitas 21*, a pioneering global network, was formed in Australia in 1997 to help its members to become international and Europeanised Universities (Sadlak 1998 as cited in Scott 2006: 31). However, it is mostly trans-national migration that actively shapes cosmopolitan networks in post-modern academia. Bourdieu's views on academic tribes and networks are actually mirrored by Castells' sociology of global networks. Against this trans-national background, academic career now involves the formation of qualitatively different, intellectual diasporic networks.

As Lohmann (op cit: 22) notes with reference to Europe, the target of such trans-national initiatives is to create the 'European knowledge society'. Thus internationalization of higher education should be associated with both its global

¹⁴ For information on trans-national corporations and examples of the TNC effect, see Castells (1998).

expansion and the knowledge economy, where trans-nationalism is meant to foster this new economy.

The target of the frequently talked about knowledge economy, related to globalization, is the creation of a knowledge society that will be global in its economic, transportation, communication and social problems. And at the heart of this new information society project are universities. According to Scott (2006: 1), they function as 'pivotal organizations', or the 'central institutions', in the 'age of information'.

In reference to the earlier mentioned transition from Model to Mode 2 knowledge, Castells (1996: 8) remarks that 'the communicative concept of the University' has changed and as a result of this change 'new links between the University and the [wider] society have shaped'. The University ceases to deliver the modern 'socio-political mission...of propagating the national culture' (Scott 2006: 32). Thus through the prism of the knowledge economy, the main purpose of global universities now is to produce people who will 'appreciate diverse cultures and traditions' – in other words, to promote 'preparation for global citizenship', which becomes a discursive precondition for the knowledge economy (Scott 2006: 31). It means that universities must be 'flexible enough to respond to emerging social demands' (Scott 2006: 1). In this regard, Florida (2005: 252) expects that higher education institutions should be 'the intellectual hubs of the creative economy', 'bastions and breeders of tolerance' and 'a natural source of diversity'. This is also the position of Altbach (1998), who argues that both the university and the knowledge it produces are 'increasingly international during the post-modern age'.

This cultural expansion of higher education is supported by its administrative expansion – that is, by changes in traditional University structures, which now resemble very much that of other enterprises (Allakhverdov, 1996; Altbach 1998; 2001; 2003; Bok 2003; Castells 2000; Delanty 2001; Jacob & Hellstrom 2000; Leslie & Slaughter 1998). This is how the University delivers the new, 'corporate', mission - with its principle of 'managerial excellence' – in order to compete in the global marketplace (Scott 2006: 32). As Ozga et al. (2006: 7) note, the knowledge economy 'is believed to be the basis of national competitive advantage within the international marketplace'. With this pursuit in mind, the University is actually becoming a 'trans-

national corporation itself, serving global consumers rather than national subjects' (Scott op cit).

According to Scott (2006), globalization, with the predicted (however, not yet real) erosion of the nation-state by trans-national capital, is forcing a major change in the academy. And Universities are expected to be irreplaceable in this transformation, which means that their chances to steer the 'knowledge economy' and attract the draining brains of the most talented must be much higher than those of other bodies. Post-modern Universities are said to actively participate in the discourses of the knowledge economy or information revolution and the consequent brain drain, at least, on equal terms with other organizations such as high technology firms and businesses (Castells 2000; Delanty 2001; Florida 2005; Jacob & Hellstrom 2000; Scott 2006). Thus the emerging discourse of academic mobility generally derives from the well-propagated discourse of the knowledge economy, which exclusively promises the benefits of global citizenship.

In this milieu, the 'international contact', or 'international networking', becomes an essential feature of the post-modern academic life, as observed by Smeby and Trondal (2005: 450). Referring to the phenomenon of international contact, they point to 'a range of its different forms', including (1) short-term 'professional journeys related to conferences, guest lecturing, study and research visits, evaluation work and research collaboration'; (2) 'international publishing'; and (3) 'international research collaboration'. This academic mobility is 'becoming more frequent and even becoming a kind of professional standard in some disciplines' (Musselin 2004: 73). International contact has many forms and brain drain is the most extreme among them. More and more academics work abroad and more and more Universities benefit by employing foreign scholars (Delanty 2001; Jacob & Hellstrom 2000; Slaughter 2001). In this connection, Altbach (2004: 8-10) emphasises 'an increasingly robust international migration of academic talent', which 'will continue in the current globalized environment'.

The most visible sign of internationalization is conceptualised by Altbach (2004) as a long-term, though not necessarily irrevocable, trans-continental academic Odyssey, including the post-modern brain drain – though Altbach himself questions the texture of this intellectual drainage by referring to the increased trans-national

liaisons of migrating academics. In relation to this, Kuznetsov and Sabel (2006) point to the multi-vector phenomenon of 'brain circulation', thus stressing the positive connotation of this global movement and the vast human capital resources it can offer to various systems of higher education. It is evident that the internationalization of higher education – as well as the new knowledge economy - is primarily associated with such mobility-bound concepts as 'ingenuity', 'brain drain' or 'competition for talent' (Burbules & Torres 2000; Castells 2000; Faini 2003; Florida 2004; 2005; Kuznetsov & Sabel 2006).

The future of this academic mobility is seen as the diasporization of academic life. In this connection, Marginson (2008) mentions 'the freewheeling transferability of intellectual capacity', 'the contribution of mobility to innovation' and the overall 'perception that mobility is increasing'. The appropriate concept of 'knowledge diaspora or 'academic diaspora' embodies the key notion of interstices and in-betweenness' and 'presents a further challenge to the taken-for-granted status of the nation state in education' (Welch & Zhen 2008). These factors give life to 'the ideological assertions about "borderlessness" in faculty work' (Marginson 2008).

However, sceptics question the borderless of academic mobility when looking at brain drain recipients and, consequently, the inequality of globalization (Altbach 2004; Marginson 2008). To estimate the degree to which international mobility represents freedom from the nation-state, it is important to look very carefully at the local configurations of the global transformation of higher education. Since the earlier mentioned sceptics of globalization firmly believe in the power of the nation-state, the post-industrialization or globalization of universities is a multi-faceted process that takes a variety of forms. Regarding this, Ozga et al. (2006: 5) note that though 'existing alongside other contexts...the national scale continues to provide a particular set of cultural scripts'. In other words, while approaching the changing nature of post-modern Universities, it is important to be attentive to how educational globalization is localised. Here it is important to pay attention to the compromise between cosmopolitanism brought forward by globalization and the remains of the still powerful nationalism or between nationalism and the embryo of globalization.

Responding to the brain drain processes and accommodating international talent, the University grows stronger as a global academic community (Florida 2004; 2005;

Scott 2006). For example, the studies mentioned above show that specifically during the last twenty years, America has been shaped by its 'creative class, which includes trans-national scholars first of all.¹⁵

What is evident about the globalization of higher education is that it is a rather elusive phenomenon, as both uneven and multi-focal, or abstract. Firstly, the 'world of globalised higher education is highly unequal', as observed by Altbach (2004: 4). In this connection, he further remarks that the 'world of [academic] centres and peripheries grows ever more complex' and pinpoints the north-westward 'flow of academic talent at all levels' (Altbach 2004: 5-8). As Florida (2005: 4) remarks, 'in many ways...the United States is the world's centre of ingenuity' or of the knowledge economy. Thus writing about the internationalization of higher education and faculty mobility, Marginson (2008) points to the 'predominantly American-aligned globally mobile labour'. Florida (2005: 105) ironically recognises the American strategy of 'people replacement' – that is, 'importing talent from elsewhere instead of growing one's own creative population'. This illustrates the extent to which the brain drain into the USA facilitates the expansion of globalization. Inspired by the USA, 'the competition for creative talent...[which] is the biggest magnet for globalised innovation...is heating up in all corners of the globe' now and new centres of the global creative economy can emerge quickly (Florida 2005: 7-16). The USA, together with many other countries, is 'critically dependent upon foreign talent in its economy', whose significant pools are foreign students and scholars (Florida 2005: 11).

Secondly, in practice we actually deal with many global universities - interconnected yet independent - rather than with one collective global school or one collective global academy. And each of them is localised in an independent nation-state:

The powerful Universities have always dominated the production and distribution of knowledge, while weaker institutions and systems with

¹⁵ Florida (2005: 11) describes high-skilled trans-national workers as the 'global talent' or 'creative class'. Saying that the US is 'critically dependent upon foreign talent in its economy', he pinpoints trans-national academics as one of the main 'pools of foreign talent' (op cit). See also Kuznetsov and Sabel (2006).

fewer resources and lower academic standards have tended to follow in their wake. Academic centres provide leadership in all aspects of science and scholarship...The centres tend to be located in larger and wealthier countries and benefit from the full array of resources (Altbach 2004: 4).

Therefore people who decide to join the global academy as 'draining brains' actually join a particular university and have to comply with the regulations of its nation-state.¹⁶

Still the majority of post-modern intellectuals in the current context of globalised academic work are now forming as 'a much leaner, more cosmopolitan, less defence-oriented, more competitive community of scientists' within the cosmopolitan academy that emerges as a straightforward outcome of academic mobility (Sher 2000). Mentioning the historic nature of the internationalization of Western scholarly thought (dating to 'the times of European scholasticism'), Castells (1996: 125) concludes that now more than ever before 'science is...structured around networks of researchers who interact through publications, conferences, seminars and academic associations'.¹⁷ In this connection, he recognises 'the formation of a global scientific system' (op cit). This conceptualization of the cosmopolitan academy resonates with Delanty (2001: 128), who stresses the 'cosmopolitan dimension' of many Universities and academic careers.

¹⁶ Here researchers warn against underestimating the impact of migration regulations upon both academic work and identities. For more information, see Florida (2005) and Kofman (2005).

¹⁷ The idea of academic cosmopolitanism, as based on educational networking and expansion, is not new at all. For example, the university network in Europe continued its incredible expansion throughout early modern times. Early modern civilization was characterized by global exploration and New World colonization (Dyer 1889; Rothblatt 1997; Scott 2006). What is new in the recent context is the phenomenon of the higher education 'industry', marked with more complex relationships and more complex organizational forms than those of the early days (Scott 2006: 145).

Conclusion

Summing up academic career, when we look at it as a life journey we can still clearly see certain stages, or periods, in academic life. This journey is marked with individuality and tribal affiliation because academics can be both intellectual and anti-intellectual, depending on the social context and the conditions of the academic game. How these two features are localised at a particular time of the academic life is what determines the academic identity. Thus academic identities can be very dynamic – as long as the social context of academic work changes. This change can be caused by a variety of factors. In my research, I refer to globalization as one of the most important forces that change academic lives and transfer the universal academic tribalism into the qualitatively new paradigm of academic trans-nationalism.

As scholars admit, the turbo-economics and the entrepreneurial spirit, conveyed in the global flows, make careers, in general, and academic lives, in particular, fragmented and visibly incoherent, thus disrupting traditional career routes and causing identity crisis. Concluding on the nature of the global shift in the academy, Altbach (2003), Bok (2003) and Slaughter and Leslie (1997) assume that these changes are rapid. They are also very ‘dramatic’ – that is, complex and structural (Altbach 2003). The whole structure of modern academy and academic profession is modified. Above that, these alterations are long-term. There is a slim chance that they will vanish, allowing academics to settle down to the common round as before, because multinational corporations, as Slaughter and Leslie further explain, do and will turn increasingly to Universities for ‘science-based products to market in a global economy’ (1997).

Compared with many other careers, academic work becomes additionally complicated by the increasing requirement of international contact. International contact, or academic trans-nationalism, has a variety of forms and brain drain is the most extreme among them. Musselin (2004: 55) notes that despite its long history – dating to the Middle Ages of higher education in Europe – academic mobility inevitably and, in many cases, painfully breaks the habitual logic of traditional, closed, societies. Thus international contact is not new but modernity, with its

emerging strong nation-states, put international contact in hibernation and caused the 'Neolithic revolution' among academics (Bauman 1991: 90). The global international contact now functions as the Neolithic contra-revolution by returning academics to the 'nomadic life' (op cit). And the Soviet brain drain is one of the most extreme cases.

As a result, we have a category of people – trans-national academics or draining brains. They start their careers in one social system (for example, the Soviet Union) and continue them in totally different systems. No one knows for sure how to assist them in their transgression. My case is represented by the first generation of post-Soviet Russian academic emigrants, most of who transferred to the West at the so-called establishment and even maintenance stages of their career development.

There is a question of how to study their academic lives since they are full of disruption, uncertainty, vulnerability and unpredictability. Considering the recognised normalcy of the emerging, global, context of higher education worldwide, the thesis adopts the whole life approach to academic career rather than the traditional developmental perspective, as I have already mentioned. I will further explain in the chapter on methodology how interpretive research helps me to understand their perception of their own academic lives and transition to the globalizing world, in which they now assess the validity of their homeland intellectual legacy. In this connection, it is important to remember that the simultaneous fragmentation and intensification of the global world manifests itself, in the opinion of Bauman (1991), through a multitude of interactive, yet distinct, modalities - one of which is the Russian case, presented in the next chapter.

Chapter 3. Russia and Russian academy: From totalitarianism to globalization

Omnia mutantur, nihil interit (Latin).
Everything changes, nothing perishes.
(Ovidius, '*Metamorphosis*')

Signature of all things I am here to read.
(James Joyce, '*Ulysses*')

Introduction

In this chapter, I look at the impact of the contradictory forces upon higher education in a particular context, that of post-soviet Russia, and consider the influence of rapid modernization on a system and society that has had a particular relationship to knowledge production. Here I would like to examine where Russia is located in the global array of new spatial and cultural parameters and what factors make people, particularly, academics, emigrate. To understand these issues, it is important for us to look back at the Soviet legacy left in post-modern Russia.

The Soviet Union had a relatively short life, of no more than seventy years, before it collapsed in 1991. It left a very rich heritage of academic life to post-Soviet Russia and to the whole world, thus greatly contributing to the creation of the world's cosmopolitan academy. The prolific academic life of the Soviet Union was mostly concentrated in its centre – Russia and, especially, in the Moscow capital, in such academic institutions as the Moscow State University (MSU) and the Soviet Academy of Sciences (SAS). These hubs of the Soviet academic life were famous for their strong academic communities and the cult of science, associated with an insatiable knowledge quest and extremely high quality of teaching and research. As is evident, post-modern Russia is failing to nurture this intellectual heritage to the fullest, whereas the West is more than welcoming this precious intellectual capital.

Overall, the nature of Soviet academic life was very complex. On the one hand, the Soviet academy was imbued with anti-intellectualism, related to the Communist Party's ideology and the terror stemming from the KGB (the Committee of the State

Security, the Party's special department), whose representatives carefully watched over intellectual development in every academic institution. The higher the rank of the institution, the more rigid the control by the KGB. On the other hand, the severe regime stimulated the most talented academic people to invest in their intellectual capital and to reveal their best intellectual qualities (Soyer 2001). Researchers still puzzle over this paradox of socialism, but the superiority of academic quality owes a lot to the hardships of Soviet totalitarianism (Graham 1998; Neuman 1976; Dornan 1975; Soyer 2001).

The Soviet academy managed to incorporate the best part of pre-revolutionary Russian intellectual capital, as represented, for example, by Academician Vernadsky, who was famous for his unbreakable intellectualism and readiness to die for his academic tribe (which he did) (Bailes 1986; Vucinich 1982).¹⁸ The position of a true intellectual above the state power was carried on by the national academic hero academician Sakharov, who is officially honoured now as 'the conscience of the Soviet Russian science' (Dornan 1975). In any case, we see that Soviet science *did* have its own conscience and its own soul – the feature that made the academy very robust under crude political pressure. It is now hard to say what traditions scholars discuss when referring to this conscience – Russian or Soviet – because the Russian intellectual culture was so deeply ingrained, though of course, somehow transformed, in the consequent academic culture of the Soviet Union.

This academic culture, the values that managed to survive the totalitarian regime, has stepped into post-modernity and now may exist mostly in the West, as performed by those who constitute the brain drain from Russia. Post-Soviet Russia substantially lacks capacity to preserve this culture in its original context, incompatible with the emerging market forces. The market has changed the Soviet academic environment and therefore forced many talented academics to join the global universities of the West in search of a better academic home to nurture their work.

¹⁸ After the Great October Revolution, Vladimir Vernadsky consciously turned down an opportunity of emigration out of solidarity with his students, who were forced to stay. As a result, he was imprisoned and later executed as 'the public enemy' reluctant to cooperate with the Soviet regime. For more detail on Vernadsky's case, see Vucinich (1982).

In order to understand these cultural dislocations in and the brain drain from the post-Soviet Russian academy, it is important to consider how Soviet Russia was transformed from the Brezhnev era into early post-modernity – that is, over the thirty years from the late 1960s to the early 1990s. This time shift is covered by the life stories of my informants, whose Soviet career development was in the socialist stagnation of the 1970s-1980s and in the perestroika of 1985-1990 and whose exodus from the country coincided with the first four years of post-Soviet Russia (the years noted for social and economic instability).

Looking back at those days, research suggests that the understanding of the Soviet academy and its input in the global brain drain is impossible without examining the issue of anti-Semitism in Soviet higher education, which will also be discussed in this chapter. It will help us to see how the collapse of the Soviet academy was steered from within.

In general, in analysing the collapse of the Soviet academy in Russia and its consequent importation to the West, researchers refer to Russia's historical proclivity for unconsciously imitating the West and to the country's unjustifiable rush to plunge into globalization, again on quite irrational grounds (Azmanova 1992). Thus Russia and its academy represent one of the most extreme cases of political and economic global change, which may be conceptualised as non-mature globalization of society and higher education.

New nation of post-modernity: A political teenager

As research acknowledges in reference to political globalization, its main feature is the overall new world order, which is particularly evident in the sub-national break through (Beck 2000; Castells 1997). This is best of all displayed by the Soviet empire collapse and the formation of the former Soviet Republics, one of which is Russia. Undergoing its *political puberty*, post-Soviet Russia now behaves like a *political teenager* of sixteen years old, who probably develops under the impact of adult remnants such as the 'communist criminalization' and the 'economy

of favours'¹⁹ and therefore may have a high potential for turning into a political juvenile delinquent. The overall societal uncertainty often raises the question of whether the Soviet nation still exists or is now only 'imagined'.

A two-headed bride

To understand the evolution of the nation, it is important to refer to the ideas of Ernest Gellner. In his fundamental work *Nations and Nationalism* (1983), he offers a metaphorical framework for analyzing culture-state relations, which can be formulated in terms of *the culture-state marriage*. This model can be successfully applied to the USSR case as explaining the inconsistencies after the Soviet collapse. Gellner suggests four models of national development in Europe: (1) neither bride (national culture) nor bridegroom (the powerful state) is ready for the marriage (establishment of the nation); (2) both the bride (culture) and the bridegroom (state) are ready; (3) the bride (national culture and national consciousness) is ready for the marriage whereas the bridegroom (the state) is not; and (4) the Soviet Union model, which has very indefinite relations between the national culture and the state. Developing model 4, it seems reasonable to mention that in the Soviet Union, founded in 1922, there was a forceful bride-groom, as represented by the communist state, whereas there was no matching bride or appropriate national culture. As a result, the dictatorial state started to transform and distort the national consciousness during the on-going years, in order to facilitate the culture-state marriage.

The Soviet case may well illustrate the 'invention thesis', formulated by Gellner, as cited in Smith (1991). This thesis says that nationalism 'invents nations where they do not exist' (op cit: 29). Therefore, in terms of Gellner's logic, it is quite possible that the 'husband' (the communist state) moulds the non-existent 'bride' (the Soviet culture or the Soviet nation). Related to the culture-state relations, Smith refers to Hobsbawm's idea that national culture are 'inventions in both their content and form' (1991: 29). In Smith's opinion (op cit), national cultures – 'brides', as Gellner would call them – 'form out of a creative process of selection and composition of the past...with ancient values and institutions that evoke entirely

¹⁹ For information on the 'communist criminalization', see Brown (2002) and Nazarov (2004). For details on its constituent 'economy of favours', refer to Ledeneva (1998).

novel meanings'. Smith (op cit) further clarifies that the cultural or national 'symbols take on a different significance through the modern ritual and institutional forms'. Considering such processes as 'banal nationalism', Billig (1995) would most likely call it 'waving the national flag daily'. Gellner would probably define this scenario in terms of the 'bridegroom' (state) impacting upon the 'bride' (national culture).

Scholars associate the culture of pre-revolutionary Russia with Russian Orthodoxy and the 'language of Pushkin' (Benevich n.d.; Slezkine 2004) and observe that those values were later modified into the culture of the Soviet intelligentsia, as based on communist ideology and Soviet patriotism. In Gellner's terms, this culture may be portrayed as a bride with two heads. The bride's initial head might symbolically represent the Russian culture based on Russian religion. The bridegroom in the face of the Soviet state - put that head into lethargy and fixed another one instead - the new head representing communist ideology. The bride remained the same yet not the same anymore. The newly moulded culture was akin to a zombie culture - a zombie bride.

The question is what kind of children could be born in a marriage like this - from the father who is a forceful abuser and the mother who is a zombie? 'The Union of the Impossible States', says Castells (1998: 33-6), 'with an incoherent patchwork of people, nationalities and state institutions'. Derived from independent studies on the Soviet national culture, the Soviet 'bride' can be described as sometimes dissident and rejecting the communist dogmas. Yet, in most case, it was known as 'the universalistic communism...and collective identity' (Smith 1991: 119), 'the stagnating corpse of Marxism', 'a victim of the communist criminalization' (Nazarov 2004) and 'a highly militarised society...held together by the regime's propaganda' (Smith 1991: 115). As Smith (1991: 121) further remarks, 'This empire of culturally differentiated peoples was held together ultimately by despotism'.

New empire and Circe's touch²⁰

As Carrère d'Encausse (1993: xii) observes, the USSR was a 'super-power...recognised as such by the international community in Helsinki in 1975'. She further remarks that de facto the USSR was perceived as an even stronger 'imperial power'. The Great October Revolution had smashed the 'empire of the tsars' in 1917, just in order to 'reconstruct' it yet in a new modality (op cit: x). Thus the Russian empire collapsed only to be 're-incarnated' in 1922 as the 'Soviet empire', whose breakdown seventy years later was pre-determined by the unhealthy relations between the Soviet elite (whose power was of the imperial nature) and the social groups (op cit: xii). One such group was Soviet academics living in a state of totalitarian exile.

In 1956 Kulski points to the Communist Party's 'elitist nature', which revealed itself 'through advancing workers and neglecting the demands of intelligentsia' (op cit: 159). He refers to the fundamental principle established by Lenin, according to which, 'By educating the worker's party, Marxism educates the vanguard of the proletariat to be capable of assuming power and leading the whole people to Socialism, of directing and organizing the new order'.

Examining the failure of Marxist ideology, Kulski (1956: 223) explains that originally it made a promise to the individual about the Socialist State 'progressively withering away' and leaving people absolutely free. It did not explain, however, how such a stateless society would function and leaves the problem of the future structure of this 'socialist heaven to the imagination of each Marxist' (op cit). Soviet propaganda portrayed the age of Communism (with commodities distributed according to the citizen's needs and independently of the value of his work). However, low standards of living, low wages of the average Soviet citizen and the

²⁰ *Circe* is a mythical figure, mentioned in 'Odyssey' (Homer 8000 B.C.) and 'Ulysses' (Joyce 1922). With a touch of her hand, that lady magician turned Ulysses' friends into pigs while they were asleep, as described by Homer. In the novel 'Ulysses', Joyce metaphorically associates Circe with the hostess of the brothel – one of the places visited by the main character, where people get drunk and lustful and thus behave like pigs, metaphorically speaking. In my research, the 'Circe's touch' is related to the era of socialist stagnation with such distinctive features as alcoholism, despair, cynicism and anti-intellectualism. These evils of developed socialism, or 'communist criminalization', in the USSR are described by Brown (2002) and Nazarov (2004).

stress on the rapid development of heavy industries at the expense of light industries were far from confirming the realization of that project.

Living conditions in the Soviet Union deteriorated particularly under Brezhnev, in the 1970-1980s. Brown (2002) looks at this negative shift in terms of the 'policy failure' of the state. Regarding economic policy, in the 1970s industry and agriculture both failed to live up to expectations (McCauley 1981). The rate of economic growth in the Soviet Union had been in long-term decline from the 1950s to the early 1980s (Brown op cit).

As for social policy in the Brezhnev era, the great discrepancy between different geographical areas of the Soviet Union went on increasing throughout the 1970s (McCauley 1981). Brown's (2002) research on that period registers lower life expectancy, especially among adult males (attributed to enormous alcohol consumption), and higher infant mortality rates. At the same time, McCauley (1981) acknowledges the increase in the educational level and cultural aspirations in the centre. Surrounded by the economically and culturally weakened periphery, the Soviet centre – that of Moscow – was always very strong, nurturing intellectual traditions.

Describing the Brezhnev era, Ledeneva (1998) points to the so-called 'economy of favours' or the second economy permeating the whole of Soviet society in 1970-1980s and eventually leading it to collapse. The economy of favours was a pervasive social practice, unique to the Soviet bloc. It conveyed 'exchange of favours of access' in conditions of shortages and a state of system privileges. While delivered in formal organizations, the economy of favours was highly ritualised, embedded in informal networks and related to 'mundane favours'. It enabled people to obtain goods, services, or statuses that were legal as such but were bureaucratically controlled and rationed in illegal ways, including bribery or sexual favour. This practice became a societal mundane survival strategy. In Soviet academia the economy of favours was manifested as unfair decisions of college admissions, academic recruitment and career promotion, thus pre-determining quite peculiar features of Soviet academic tribalism.

Overall, the despotic husband was always keeping the bride in check. Regarding the national consciousness of Soviet people, 'they were subjected to terror, to the erasure

of memory, and to confinement within a total and totalitarian system of values' (Carrère d'Encausse 1993: xi). That is why the system appeared 'impervious to fundamental change' in the years of Leonid Brezhnev's reign – that is, in 1964 through 1982 (Brown 2002).

Intellectual dissent

Before Brezhnev, however, in the life of the Soviet 'bride' there was a short period of Thaw (and I would like to call it the 'Soviet Renaissance'), steered by Khrushchev's 'brief and limited liberalization' (Smith 1991: 109). In the opinion of Smith (op cit), the time that is now recalled as the golden age or the halcyon days of the Soviet Union was marked with 'recurring national revivals among the intellectuals'. These attitudes of the Soviet intelligentsia are described by Smith as confrontation of 'the destructive moral and material impact on their societies of a tyrannical state-imposed socialist modernization and seeking alternatives in a pre-Bolshevik past' (op cit). Smith points to the 'profound disillusionment on the part of many Soviet intellectuals with Marxist-Leninist scientific dogmas' and the 'formation of dissident circles [among them] to achieve civil and democratic rights within the [Soviet] Union' (op cit: 110).

It was the ideological vacuum (related to the 'ossified, ritualised yet outside the universally discredited and ignored the Soviet Marxism-Leninism') that facilitated the dissenting forces to show signs of intellectual rebellion (Reddaway 1975: 122). In fact, the Soviet 'double consciousness' eventually led to dissident thinking, according to Smith (1991). As he further explains, the 'classic situation of blocked mobility' under totalitarianism 'created a broad social constituency' for dissident attitudes (op cit: 112).²¹ As a result, many groups outside the state apparatus had developed increasingly dissenting features (Reddaway 1975: 121). The most classic example of the intellectual/academic dissent was Andrei Sakharov, a representative of the imprisoned, behind-the-bar, elite. One of the fathers of the Soviet hydrogen bomb, he was also known as 'the conscience of a liberal scientist' (Dornan 1975:

²¹ Reddaway (1975: 121) explains that under Stalin Soviet society was effectively 'atomised by the application over two decades of mass terror'. In an important if paradoxical sense, it was 'de-politicised' or politically inert. After his death in 1953 a process of incipient re-politicisation began, encouraged by Khrushchev yet impeded by his successors.

355). In 1968 his fundamental work 'Reflections', containing a thesis about intellectual freedom as a pre-condition for true science, turned him into a hero of the Soviet/Russian academic nation, though persecuted by the regime (Dornan op cit).

Particularly under Brezhnev, dissent was closely monitored by the KGB and when discovered it was persecuted by Soviet law. Article 190-1, specifically concerning dissent penalised the propagation of 'deliberate fabrications that discredit the Soviet political and social system'. The penalties were relatively light – up to three years' imprisonment or five years' exile. However, these practices were often linked to and portrayed as those of opposition (though dissent and opposition are totally different political forces). And this opposition was viewed as a strong type of political offence – weakening and over-throwing the Soviet system as a whole. The penalties were thus more severe under Articles 70 and 72 (Reddaway 1975: 124). In this respect, the KGB had the absolute power to decide whether to prosecute under article 70 or under article 190-1 (op cit: 125).

The end of the empire: the USSR posthumous

Highlighting the following years, Smith (1991: 115) says that perestroika was 'an unsuccessful struggle to marketise the Soviet economy', which had already started to break under the totalitarian husband. Gorbachev's goal was to rebuild the weakened power and to speed up progress (Carrère d'Encausse 1993: xi).

His reforms were actually 'the modernization of the bad smelling corpse of Marxism' (Smith 1991: 382). In this connection, Smith views glasnost' as the time of released cynicism and theft and of releasing everything that was prohibited earlier, both the true and the false. Soviet society suddenly discovered that in the USSR, power, progress, and control over technology and nature concealed only weaknesses, backwardness, technological under-development, and the destruction of nature (Carrère d'Encausse 1993: xii).

Studies recognise many evils of that epoch. For example, Nazarov (2004: 424) mentions that providing reforms within the framework of socialism, many KGB and CPSU leaders in the higher ranks already foresaw the USSR collapse and therefore, reserved 'reservoir airdromes'. By 'reservoir airdromes' he means making preparations for where to go and what to do as soon as the Soviet regime collapsed.

Some academics also started to scan such reservoir airdromes in the middle and late 1980s, when the USSR was still alive. The reservoir airdrome phenomenon largely explains why academic people started to emigrate. Thus 'the vast Soviet empire, the last empire on earth, eventually crumbled before the world's astonished eyes' (Carrère d'Encausse 1993: xi).

The Soviet collapse in 1991 was forced by the conflict between people's living styles, the culture of violence, and state power. Gellner's (1983) model may be complementary to Azmanova's (1992) theory when answering the question of why the commodification of Russian life, in general, and of its higher education, in particular, is a failure. Gellner's answer would be: because Russia repeats the effort to force political decisions (in the present case, those of a market oriented economy) upon the unprepared and weak national culture. That is why, there is little harmony in the emerging matrimony between the new Russian market and the non-existing post-modern culture. Danilova and Yadov (1997: 320) remark, 'Now Russian people have a 're-born identity' and 'being re-born is much more difficult'.

In the opinion of Azmanova (1992), post-Soviet Russia has no stable platform for global economic and democratic changes. Therefore, the extremely rapid 'imitation of the West', which is a long-established practice in the region, is fraught with unpredictable and often undesirable outcomes, including those in education (Azmanova op cit: 144). She (op cit: 149) attributes Russian problems to the distorted version of marketization in Russia, which contains alien 'standards of commodification and bureaucratization'. Russian late modernity could almost be characterised as a distorted version of colonization: a new society had been designed 'not organically, as a settlement [with a new, cosmopolitan, culture], but synthetically, as a building' [with requirements imposed from the outside] (Azmanova op cit). The principle of Russian commodification derives from the elite-serving nature of socialist organization and distribution rather than mass consumption. Russia in transition, like other east-European countries in the former socialist bloc, does not 'draw its new normativity from itself', but merely transplants Western legislative and administrative practices as a façade of egalitarian society (op cit: 150). That is why the Russian installation of western democratic norms that are

taken out of their original societal contexts produces an aberration from what is traditionally implied by democracy (op cit: 154).

As Danilova and Yadov (1997: 320) remark, 'civil society [in Russia] has not yet been formed and the mechanism for defending the rights of diverse groups of the population has been exclusively the prerogative of bureaucratic structures'. The extreme example of civil rights violation is the 'spy-mania' in the intellectual world, illustrated by the court cases of the scientists Reshetin, Schurov, Khvorostov, Akulichev, Kaibyshev, Danilov and Sutyagin (Cherny 2006).²²

Stressing the 'genesis of a new social subjectivity' in Russia, Danilova and Yadov (op cit) pinpoint an increase in individualism and a decrease in communal spirit in peoples' motivation, which is, perhaps, a chief contributor to cultural dislocations and consequent emigration.

Russian academia under the microscope

Russian academic capitalism

Resonating with overall societal restructuring, Russian higher education has been undergoing a significant transformation during the last fifteen years from a centrally monitored to a market focused system. Given major financial barriers and severe cuts in federal budgeting, Russia has modernised in line with dominant trends (UBuff, 2002). The 1990s reforms embraced the following basic features: diversification and humanization of higher education; decentralization of management and promotion of university autonomy; creation of a non-state/private sector. These initiatives have set the framework for an educational structure that seeks to meet international criteria of excellence. The Law on Education of 1992, followed by its 1996 Amendment, and the HEI Statute of 1993 became the landmark legislation for democratic governance

²² According to Amnesty International (2005), Igor' Sutyagin, eventually imprisoned for espionage for fifteen years, has been 'accused of providing information to a foreign company but the trial failed to adequately examine his defence, including his claim that all the information was available in public sources'. The official court report on the Sutyagin case points out that 'the charges against him [Sutyagin] had been so vaguely formulated' that in December 2001 the first court to consider his case had observed that they were 'impossible to understand' (op cit). Cherny (2006) states the resemblance of these cases with the Soviet records of 1937.

and institutional autonomy in higher education (UBuff 2002). There are new phenomena in Russian higher education, which fit the worldwide mainstream of global change in academia.

These innovations can be conceptualised as follows. Firstly, one of the most evident innovative practices in Russia is 'an educational boom', leading to increased numbers of higher education institutions, where commercial universities comprise almost 40% of provision (Smolentseva 2003). Secondly, the commercialization as such (that is, payment for higher education) has become a distinct innovative activity, thus establishing non-budget sources of financing as a major source for many Universities breaking the free HE tradition (op cit). Thirdly and also related to the abolition of higher education traditions, the unitary 'school-University' scheme of HE access has been replaced by a multi-stage educational system – the phenomenon internationally known as 'a second tier of higher education' (op cit). And as another tribute to the internationalization of higher education, Russia has finally allowed international foundation grants for research and teaching – a gesture that brings its educational system closer to the international community.

According to Gorbunova and Zabaev (2002), Dailey and Cardozier (2002) and Smolentseva (2003), the global educational shift has offered Russia the following tangible benefits. First of all, academics and Universities have received more academic freedom and organizational autonomy through the decentralization of higher education. This 'reasonable level of academic freedom' now allows academics to reveal 'more flexibility in thinking' - or capability for redesigning curricula and instructional methods to accommodate urgent needs (Altbach 2003). Together with this new attitude, the increased academic freedom facilitates a new attitude to research. This new perspective on research suggests that on the one hand, academic research should become part of the 'classic triad' of teaching/training research and community service. And on the one hand, globalization of higher education strongly encourages a multitude of research networking activities. Following these changes, according to Dailey & Cardozier (2002), higher education in Russia is 'more readily adaptable to the marketplace' and more pliable and creative in dealing with innovation.

However, despite these positive assessments it is evident that the cultural transition to academic capitalism presents many challenges. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the loss of employment stability caused tangible 'cultural dislocations' (Altbach 2003: 389). The immediate implementation of widespread reform also contributed to social uncertainty and bewilderment that included the academic world (Dailey & Cardozier 2002). From the 1990s reforms onwards, Russian education has been in 'a continuous state of transition' (Smolentseva 2003), moving with difficulty towards a new civilization based on the values of democracy and individual freedoms (Gorbunova & Zabaev 2002). Investigating the Russian situation in 2003, Altbach (op cit: 389) concludes that there is 'no other world region where higher education is as much *in turmoil*'. The impact of a series of economic crises of 1993-1994 and 1998 has been devastating. This had a particularly adverse effect on the hiring of academic staff and severely damaged the quality of higher education (Smolentseva 2003).

The influence of academic capitalism on professors' realities is more than obvious. The crux of the matter is that globalization affects the academic profession and makes us turn the spotlight to faculty with their miserable salaries and frantic plea for resources from the global market. Researchers observe a colossal shift in academic career development.

Traditionally, Soviet faculty was an employee category with an exclusive professional status of not 'fee-for-services practitioners' due to their historic alienation from the market (Altbach 2003: 390). Now this traditional insulation is broken and the borderline between University teachers and the outside world is blurred. As a personnel subset, academic faculty members now belong to the public sector, being, at the same time, autonomous from it. Slaughter and Leslie (1997) define them as academic capitalists 'from within the public sector' or 'state-subsidised entrepreneurs'.

The degree of impact of commercial research on academic professional identities and career paths varies. Some professors benefit from the 'strategic' (market-oriented) research both lucratively and spiritually (Slaughter & Leslie 1997). Such

academic entrepreneurs, to employ the language of Slaughter and Leslie (op cit), either give preferences to the world of business, making a career shift, or easily combine their academic loads and entrepreneurship, with the latter enriching the former.

However, there are those who resist the influence of the commercial world for quite understandable reasons. They fear lest the profit-gaining process and the calamitous power of money should penetrate too deeply into academic consciousness. Analyzing this situation, Bok (2003: 16) foresees the danger of scholars' dependence on 'the verdict of the market' for academic decision-making, especially regarding the choice of 'what to teach and whom to appoint'. Supported by the opinions of Deem and Johnson (2003) and Altbach (2003), Bok (op cit) does not welcome the perspective of 'routinely compromising' academic values for the sake of funding. The implementation of academic entrepreneurship has not been granted universal recognition.

Gorbunova and Zabaev (2002) and Smolentseva (2003) stress that along with the positive changes, a number of institutional drawbacks have sprung to life, which are fiscal, utilization-relevant and managerial by nature. Thus Russian higher education is making an effort to cope with 'the challenge of surviving' and to advance with no governmental support (Smolentseva 2003). Dailey and Cardozier (2002) remark that the accumulated potential of the past has been already consumed by many Universities and needs further update. For example, Hossler refers to the painful fact of the untimely funds exhaustion by the Ryazan State Pedagogical University in his 1997 case study, cited in Dailey and Cardozier (op cit). In 1998 Bain and colleagues sadly confess that Russian universities have been left helpless to solve these financial dilemmas.

When looking at such activities through the prism of commercialization, many of them appear as far from utilitarian. For example, the conversion of institutions to Universities fails to be utilization-focused, supplemented with 'the proliferation of private colleges of questionable quality' (Gorbunova & Zabaev 2002).

The overall disorganised management of Russian higher education has led to polarization or geographical stratification of the university community and the development of the dichotomy 'city versus province'. Dailey and Cardozier (2002) report that the Western third of Russia bears a considerable amount of higher education institutions, specifically, 40% all Russian universities are situated in the Moscow region and 10% in St. Petersburg.

In response to these and other inconsistencies, Russia resorts to quite aggressive methods of fund rising, as Dailey and Cardozier's (2002) note. Multiplied by the spontaneous development of market relations, these new funding strategies have given impetus to the reproduction of social inequality in the face of 'the locally-oriented elite', as observed by Gorbunova and Zabaev (2002).

In considering the lives of academics and their impairment by modernization, there are no less detrimental facts related to their fiscal and working conditions. Chief among these devastating forces, sketched by Gorbunova and Zabaev (op cit) and Smolentseva (2003), are reduced salaries; side work (or the *maquiladora* circumstance); absence of lifetime contracts; and academic tribalism. As we can see, these evils of academic capitalism are related both to the material and emotional aspects of academic work. In this array of globalization-caused disadvantages, salary reduction is especially tangible – and, particularly, for women professors and, specifically, in comparison with the before-perestroika period. This salary reduction turns Russian academics into *maquiladoras*. Thus they search for *part-time or side work*, which, often emerges as work at several places, destroys the work-life balance and adversely interferes with the quality of academic work. The impact of the *maquiladora* circumstance becomes even more striking with the switch from the permanent tenure track to the five-year contract system. The unclear procedures and the informational deficit around this new recruitment scheme lead to an increasing feeling of non-safety and unhealthy competitiveness in academia. The contract system thus creates fertile conditions for clannishness, and together they impose severe restrictions on academic freedom. The constantly increasing academic tribalism leads to intra-departmental clashes between faculty and administrators about working conditions and leadership styles. As a result of these academic wars

for power, more and more academics prefer distance and even abstinence from governance issues.

Knowledge production and academic emigration

Analyzing the academic profession in Russia, it is important to view scientists or researchers as a *specific category* of academic labour. Under the socialist regime, Soviet science had three basic characteristics. Firstly, it was entirely monopolised by the Communist Party. Secondly, it was generously sponsored by the state. And thirdly, it was located *separately* from teaching.

With very few exceptions, higher education institutions in the USSR concentrated on instruction with a tiny share engaged in fundamental research (Markusova et al. 2001; 2004). As Letokhov (2004) observes, Russia definitely suffers by comparison in this dimension with the West, where ‘the best scientific research of Nobel Prize standard is mostly done at universities, while Russia's research is done only at the Academy of Sciences’.²³ Until the 1990s, Soviet knowledge emerged in a form of ‘a symbiosis...of pure science, technology and engineering’, with an emphasis on military and industrial needs (op cit).

As the exclusive source of sponsorship, the Soviet state was ‘pumping money into funding science on a scale matched by a few if any other governments in history’ (Graham 1998: 68). Consequently, the reputation of this ‘big science’ was very high, especially in nuclear physics and astrophysics because of their military application (Markusova et al. 2004).²⁴ All this was happening under ‘the monopoly over intellectual life exerted by the Communist Party’ (Graham 1998: 17). Researchers commenting on this period remind us of ‘the unnecessary level of bureaucracy’, of the limited access to militarised research institutions, with their

²³ The Russian Academy of Sciences (RAS) was founded as the country's fundamental research hub. RAS has a network of academic institutions, where the major part of the country's fundamental research is conducted. These institutions recruit the most talented scientists and offer post-graduate (PhD and Doctor of Science) programmes of study. For more detail, refer the website of the RAS: <http://www.ras.ru>. Specific information about the Academy's history can be found at <http://www.prn.ru/eng/history/>.

²⁴ The term ‘big science’ is used by Kojevnikov (2002: 421).

'secret mailboxes', of 'secret cities' and of the imprisonment of scientists who did not conform to the rules of Soviet science (Graham 1998; Widdis 1995; Zueyv 1998). Crude political control of soviet science had a devastating effect on its quality and also produced an economy separated from the rest of the world and the intellectual ostracism of scientists (Ismail-Zadeh 2004; Soyfer 2001).

However, if the working conditions of Soviet academics are assessed from an insider perspective, these did involve relatively high levels of payment and career stability, so that security existed but at the price of independence. Financial security may well outweigh many of the current advantages offered by globalizing processes in the Academy. Severe reductions of state funding following the collapse of the Soviet system leaves scientists on very low salaries (Gerber & Yarsike-Ball 2002). There is a lack of experimental equipment - that is, in most cases not compensated for by external grants (Bunchuk 2005; Zuyev 1998). In addition there may be some psychological discomfort caused by the need to adjust to market competition (Ismail-Zadeh 2004). The scientific community remains quite conservative and nostalgic for the halcyon days of state support (op cit). According to Zuyev (1998), fundamental research in Russia today is funded at a level that is ten times below the level at which it was funded in the USSR, with a median salary constituting employment category number ten out of the eleven available in Russia. The costs of electricity reduce capacity to use equipment by half.

Gerber and Yarsike-Ball (2002) suggest that an academic career in Russia is similar to that of a beggar. In these conditions there is indeed no incentive for the most capable young scholars to enter research (Zuyev 1998). Russia is losing its most able scientists to more lucrative domains outside academia or abroad (Ismail-Zadeh 2004; Letokhov 2004). Thus transformation is accompanied by a rate of almost 30% of scientific personnel loss at the RAS institutes (Zuyev 1998). According to data from the year 2002, 100,000 academics left Russia taking the equivalent of 50 billion United States dollars in value to the receiving countries (Ismail-Zadeh 2004) and consequently becoming successful in the West (Letokhov 2004). There is a great demand for 'new young blood' (Zuyev 1998) in the 'ageing' Russian academy (Gerber & Yarsike-Ball 2002). This suggests the needs for

reformers in higher education to concentrate on the politics of science ‘rejuvenation’ (Gerber & Yarsike-Ball 2002) or ‘repatriation’ (Ismail-Zadeh 2004) by creating appropriate domestic conditions and rewards.

The Russian case allows scientific thought to reconsider the traditional view of labour demand as based solely on the quantity of vacancies. Independent studies observe that Russia is marked by a substantial lack of decent working opportunities for its academics. A new assumption can be made that working conditions or job design, known as ‘ergonomics’ (Peters & Waterman 1982), must not be ignored as a measurement tool for assessing the labour demand elasticity and therefore, as a measurement tool for assessing the global labour recipient’s capacity to accommodate economic emigrants.²⁵ In the majority of cases, the low, or inelastic, academic labour demand, for example, in Russia, is not necessarily due to unemployment but also due to unacceptable working conditions or unsuitable ergonomics forcing people to quit their jobs. The reasons for a high demand of academic labour in the West include not only job vacancies due to the ‘shortage of domestic faculty’ (Basil 2006: 516) but also an appropriate infrastructure for academic work that attracts academic emigrants.

The elasticity of the post-modern academic labour demand cannot be treated through the prism of marketization only. And here academy is placed above the society and the rest of economics. The academic labour demand and drive for academic emigration start to look different if viewed from the angle of the model conditions for academic work. Some may argue that in Russia the academic labour demand (the ratio between employment and education) is not inelastic at all. In their opinion, though the state has collapsed, there are many jobs offered in the private sector. However, this viewpoint contradicts the logic of academic ergonomics, derived from the intellectuals’ professional patriotism - or the necessity to work entirely in one’s scientific domain and avoid any distraction (Featherstone 1988:

²⁵ By ‘elasticity of labour demand’, Peters and Waterman (1982) understand the ability of a labour market, with its job openings, to accommodate the inflow of educated or qualified people. The elastic labour demand means such market conditions under which qualified job applicants (*labour supply*) are ‘*demand*ed’ by the market – that is, offered adequate jobs. A classic example of inelastic labour demand is societal unemployment, marked by organisational downsizing and shortages of job vacancies.

209). At the same time, through the prism of academic ergonomics, the academic labour demand in Russia is far from elastic because true intellectual cannot work anywhere. The loyalty to true science demands 'twenty-four hour of brainwork' (op cit). Therefore, the academic labour demand in Russia needs to be *stretched* urgently. By now only the brain drain seems the most viable approach to stretching the ratio.

In this light, is the academy separate from or ingrained in society? The answer is yes and no. In terms of labour supply and demand, intellectuals cannot be approached under the same conditions as the rest of the society. Yet within the academy itself, regardless of where it is located, there are very tight primordial relations. The cobweb of these relations must not be ignored in examining social bonds within the academic world.

Given these conditions and developments, some experts suggest that Russian science is in crisis or moribund. However, Gerber and Yarsike-Ball (2002) and Sher (2000) offer a more optimistic analysis that suggests that in this transitional period Russian knowledge is 'comatose' (Gerber & Yarsike-Ball 2002). They argue that, with time, the Russian environment will stabilise and a more accessible intercollegiate dialogue on a global level will emerge (Zuyev 1998), as will new forms of funding.

In the new system of multi-channel, competitive, funding (Markusova et al. 2001), there are several mechanisms, discussed by Bunchuk (2005), that appear as harbingers of a renaissance of knowledge (Bush 2004): (a) domestic grants, distributed by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR)²⁶ and other foundations; (b) grants from foreign foundations; (c) cooperation programmes; and (d) the entrepreneurial activities of Russian scientists.

Ismail-Zadeh (2004) states that grants and donations from foreign foundations are a major source of funding Russian science. The West has responded to the crisis in Russian science 'to a surprising degree' (Sher 2000). In an effort to

²⁶ RFBR is 'a government organization whose primary goal is to support the most promising research initiatives in all fields of fundamental science on a competitive basis. Nearly 70% of its budget is to support research groups and individual scientists' (Markusova et al. 2001: 541). For more detail, see to the RFBR website: <http://www.rfbr.ru/>

‘save Soviet science’, France opened a \$100 million fund (Sher op cit) and the United States of America allocated several billion dollars (Ismail-Zadeh 2004). Among the US participants in the rescue operation are such government organizations as ISTC, NATO, INTAS and CRDF as well as NGOs, including the George Soros and the MacArthur Foundations (Ismail-Zadeh op cit). Russia and western countries jointly run exchange programmes and twinning projects that include involvement by the UK Royal Society, the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences and the strategic alliance of the European Union Framework Programme with INTAS.

Both foreign and domestic mechanisms for funding Russian science lay a particular stress on its repatriation. For example, RFBR issues prestigious fellowships for Doctors of Science (Ismail-Zadeh 2004). To sum up, Russian ‘science is increasingly taking the shape of a commercial enterprise, and scholars...become entrepreneurs in the market of ideas’ (Bunchuk 2005). Sher (2000) concludes that learning ‘how to survive in today’s grant-driven environment’, Russian intellectuals are shaping ‘a much leaner, more cosmopolitan, less defence-oriented, more competitive community of scientists’.

Does this adaptability not contradict the discourse of ‘the post-Soviet Russian science-in ruins’? Does it mean that the legacy of the Soviet knowledge production has been forgotten or re-considered? These questions show how complex, or even ambivalent, the Russian case may be. That is why a key theme, throughout this section and also throughout my entire research, has been *the extent to which academic practices and dispositions, established during the Soviet era, continue to influence the Russian academy* as it faces the pressures of academic capitalism. Even those who advocate neo-liberal reform accept that Russia has been always under pressure in relation to the links between politics and knowledge. Graham (1998) argues that Soviet scientists were generously rewarded slaves of totalitarian ideology, they became post-Soviet intellectuals who are financially abandoned but mentally emancipated. Financial deprivation gradually develops into entrepreneurship in the search for new funds, which in turn produces as form of vassalage to the developing Russian academic market.

Without any doubt, politicization of Russian academy in general and Russian science in particular is tied to funding: who pays the academics, how generously, how regularly and who sets the conditions of payment. In these terms, the Soviet academic can be described as married to the state (Ashwin 2000) and the post-Soviet academic is married to the market. During the period of state marriage there were deep contradictions, for example, five Nobel Prizes in the 1930s and 1940s (Graham 1998) on the one hand and lisenkoism on the other. That influence may be felt today in the opportunistic drive to achieve fast results for commercial purposes, especially aggravated by imitation of the West.

Married to the market, modern scientists and professors have to adopt market-style competition with its rigid norms of conduct, which mean 'learning how to live in a competitive world at every level, from junior research fellow up to every academician' (Gerber & Yarsike-Ball 2002). They suggest that academics are 'no longer free to work on what interests them: rather they are compelled to engage in work that attracts grants' (Gerber and Yarsike-Ball op cit). Commercialization 'destroys the ethos' of the Russian academy (Bunchuk 2005).

The pressure of commerce and enterprise has much in common with the Soviet system of planning for knowledge (Graham 1964). Both are oriented towards the professionalization of knowledge production and knowledge enterprise: political or ideological knowledge enterprise in the first case and commercial knowledge in the second (Loy 2003). Graham (1998: xii) asks: 'How robust is science under stress? What is more important to science, freedom or money?' Russian knowledge has survived under difficult conditions, and he concludes that such conditions produce an orientation to monetary rather than intellectual values. For example, he suggests that the leading motive for academic emigration is money, and improvement of material working conditions is the most desired policy. Graham (1998: 98) argues, 'The best science will be done when both freedom and money are present'. Thus he points to the economic conditions and also explicitly mentions academic freedom as crucial factors for brain drain from Russia.

Anti-Semitism in Soviet Higher Education

As we can see, the economic concerns, together with other societal forces, eventually led to the post-Soviet mass emigration among Russian academics. A large contributor to this brain drain was the Soviet inability to solve the 'Jewish question' (Low 1990; Slezkine 2004). Now it is a firm and well-known fact that Jewish emigration from the USSR was considerable and uncontrollable, though quite predictable. The figures provided by a variety of studies are impressive though a little inconsistent. Covering the years of 1959 through 1989, Della Pergola observes in 2002 that all in all the post-WW2 Soviet Union must have lost 817,300 Jews by its crackdown. However, his research does not clarify which part of that Jewish leak was caused by emigration. 265,657 Soviet Jews left for Israel and the USA during the era of developed socialism in 1968-1985, says the NCS (2006). The fact that Della Pergola (2002) recognises Russia as the largest holder of Jewish population among the rest of the Soviet republics and as the fifth world's country in Jewish demographic share allows us to believe that the Jewish emigration particularly from Russia was undoubtedly tremendous. Yet the exact incidence on Jewish people having emigrated from the Soviet Russia is still missing in this quantitative panorama.

As observed by Salitan (1990), 18,965 Jews emigrated from Russia in 1988 whereas in 1989 that number became substantially greater. She also mentions the 1967 yearly sharp increase in Jewish emigration rates for most of the 1970s – the core years of the Soviet decline. The NCS (2006) draws our attention to another peak of the Jewish exodus from the USSR, in general, and from Russia, in particular. According to the data produced by the NCS, 284,621 Soviet Jews left for Israel and the USA in 1989-1990 alone.

Della Pergola (2002) admits that there are no precise data on overall Jewish exodus from Russia during the socialist stagnation (2002). Nor are there any statistics on *academic* Jewish migration from the Soviet Russia, in particular. We only know from Ismail-Zadeh's research (2004) that the overall brain drain has recently cost Russia around four million US dollars (\$4,000,000). The tendencies highlighted above enable me to assume that a large percentage of Russian academic emigrants is comprised of people who identify themselves as Jewish. These data lead

to the question, 'What was wrong with the Soviet Union and its national membership?

Studies state that the USSR was initially designed and formally recognised for a long time as an anti-nationalist multi-ethnic state, espousing international solidarity (Slezkine 2004; Weiner 2004). 'Encompassing numerous ethnic groups within its borders, it [the Soviet state] prided itself on its status as a new kind of state, the state of all the people, in which a new historical community existed, the Soviet people' (Carrère d'Encausse 1993: x).

Since the 1930s, nevertheless, the Soviets were actually characterised by the ideology of ethnic Russian nationalism, an essential part of which was racial anti-Semitism (Korey 1972; Slezkine 2004). Researchers frequently analyse this 'blood-and-soil' paradox of the *Soviet national membership*. The totalitarian USSR had an overprotective obsession with 'domicile citizenship' (Carrère d'Encausse 1993) and particularly stressed the sense of new home, where the previously existing territorial and cultural differences of various nationalities would be blurred and would emerge in an integral unity. Thus the focal point of the nation-building process was the formation of an artificial Soviet citizenship, devoid of an ethnic component.

Slezkine (2004) shows that, theoretically, Jews perfectly matched the Soviet membership criteria as people deprived of any territorial affiliations. As for their Jewish cultural heritage, the first generation of Soviet Jews consciously denied it in the hope that the Soviet regime would save them from anti-Semitism. Regarding their children, the Soviet Jews of the second generation – those who had been born on Soviet soil already, many of them felt no cultural affiliation with Jewry at all. The 'children of the new regime – they were the first post-revolutionary generation, the first *fully Soviet* generation, the first generation that did not rebel against their parents because their parents had done it once and for all' (op cit: 230). Thus the Soviet Jews of the second generation and onwards 'honoured Pushkin' (the symbol of Russian culture) and became 'public bearers and propagandists' of Soviet Russian culture (op cit: 71).

However, the newly 'emancipated' and 'assimilated' Jews, the Soviet first passers, celebrated their 'neutral spaces in public life' not for long (Slezkine 2004: 62). Starting from the 1930s, Russia covertly yet undeniably became the sole

promoter of the Soviet national identity. To be 'Soviet' meant to be 'Russian' and to be 'Russian' meant to be of Slavic blood (Slezkine 2004; Smith 1991). Thus the Soviet nation became a blood-bound nation. The purification of the Russian or Soviet nation (which was actually the same) had been taking place for decades under different types of cover, such as the communist campaigns of Stalin and Khrushchev's anti-cosmopolitanisms and later of Brezhnev's anti-Zionism (Korey 1995; Weiner 2004). Many studies also indicate the detrimental nature of political anti-Semitism, coming from the Russian political elite (as the promoter of the Soviet nationalism) and infiltrating various professional spheres with over-represented qualified Jewish population.

The following factors contributed to the Jewish elimination: (1) societal homogenization; (2) witch hunting and consequent fear; and (3) the search for scapegoats. The Soviet identity, whose sole promoter was Russia (Smith 1991), aimed at societal homogeneity (Smith op cit; Shtromas 1978; Weinryb 1966), which was designed as 'full integration into one Soviet nation of all the nationalities of the USSR' and 'full russification' (Shtromas op cit: 268). With their 'disproportionate prominence in science, many of the arts, journalism, medicine, and a wide range of technological and cultural occupations' (Nove & Newth 1970: 153), Jews appeared incompatible with this principle of homogenization. Therefore, they needed to be de facto 'cleansed' and 'equalised' (Pinkus 1988) but first portrayed as the 'capitalist fifth column' (Korey 1972).

In addition, the climate of socialist stagnation automatically turned Jews into targets to blame specifically for their 'parasitic enrichment' (Weinryb 1966: 524). As Pinkus (1988: 139) observes, 'like other emotional states of mind, anti-Semitism is intensified in times of crisis' and 'in the search for the guilty...the Jews were an ideal scapegoat'.

Officially the main Soviet Constitutional principle remained 'unchanged through the years', in the opinion of Shtromas (1978: 266). This principle meant "equality of all Soviet citizens regardless of their nationality or race", as declared in article 34 (op cit). Article 36 of the Constitution also proclaimed that "any and all direct and indirect restrictions of the rights of, or the establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens on grounds of race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of

racial or national exclusiveness, hostility, or contempt, shall be punished by law” (op cit). In 1967 Brezhnev, as cited in Levenberg (1970: 29), summarised the Soviet ethno-national politics by comparing it with “a diamond, which sparkles with multi-coloured facets. So does the unity of our people scintillate with the diversity of nations, each of which lives a rich, full-blooded, free and happy life”. However, behind this synthetic façade of the Soviet wellbeing, Jews were banned from access to various societal domains, including higher education (Korey 1972; Pinkus 1988).

The ugliest proportions of this political anti-Semitism were especially evident in the 1970-1980s (the Brezhnev era) in the Moscow academic circles, where compared with the periphery, the struggle for intellectual and economic resources was much more intense. In the academic world the soil benefits were associated with undergraduate education in elite Universities, such as the Moscow State University; access to post-graduate programmes in elite institutions; and career progression in science, especially towards professorship. The access to these soil benefits was impeded through ‘Jewish quotas’, which existed as a percentage, dictated by the Central Committee of the Communist Party and guarded by KGB representatives from the so-called ‘First Department’ in each institution. This percentage substantially limited the number of Jews in various professional spheres and first of all, in the academy. Korey (1972: 117) explains that these unspoken admission and recruitment quotas for Jews were part of the ‘confidential constitution’ with ‘confidential instructions’ for administrators – the command ordered non-officially or behind the façade of equality.²⁷ Thus Jews were automatically denied ‘the key to promotion in Soviet society’ through the admission and recruitment practices of universities (Korey 1970: 94). As a result of this blood-and-soil politics, many talented Jewish people were excluded in a variety of ways from academic life. Though a large number of Jews managed to obtain higher education due to their perseverance (Nove & Newth 1970; Weinryb 1966; 1970), they were still ‘unable to get into Universities of their choice on equal terms with competitors of other nationalities’ (Nove & Newth 1970: 143). In post-WW2 Soviet Russia University enrolment and all types of employment were marked with preference to Russians and

²⁷ Despite the absence of clear discriminatory procedures, Slezkine (2004: 337) pinpoints certain ‘makeshift arrangements formulated in secret and applied selectively and unevenly across economic branches, academic disciplines and administrative units’.

at the price of Jewry (Korey 1972). As a result, many talented academic Jews, eliminated during those discriminatory practices, consequently emigrated, thus having largely contributed to the leukaemia of Russian science.

Conclusion

Two basic points emerge from the discussion above. Firstly, the Russian academy has been greatly impaired and suffers from severe socio-political difficulties, some of them historically-rooted, some related to the rapid modernisation and marketisation of the system. Both the Soviet regime and the changes following its breakdown are contributory factors to the current difficulties. Some writers believe that the Russian academy is being resurrected and revitalised in the present modernization process. Others see its condition as 'comatose', with unpredictable outcomes. What is undeniable is the dependence of the functioning of HE and the development of academic careers on a risky and unstable external environment. Secondly, the case of Russia is a distinctive one, and throws into particularly sharp relief some of the trends in academic migration, commercialisation and economic pressures that feature in the reshaping of the academy globally. In this connection, the question posed for further enquiry in this thesis is to what extent this cultural distinction can be observed and nurtured in the post-Soviet academic exile. To explore its processual aspect, the issue is studied through narrative biography.

Chapter 4. Methodology: Interpretative Biography

Introduction

The method I use in this research is 'interpretative biography' (Denzin 1989), which is a form of narrative biography. To see how this method works and why it is important in a study of academic life and trans-national identities, I try to define the place interpretative biography claims to occupy in scientific research. An unconventional approach per se, interpretative biography offers additional scope for further experimenting with qualitative data, including the construction of composite autobiography for exploring highly sensitive issues.

Understanding Interpretive Biography

Evolution of the life history method

My methodological approach belongs to a more generic method of narrative inquiry, defined by Connelly and Clandinin (1990: 2) as 'the process of gathering information for the purpose of research through storytelling'. Because 'humans are storytelling organisms who - individually and collectively - lead storied lives', the study of their narratives helps to understand 'the ways humans experience the world' (op cit).

The life history approach, with which the narrative inquiry is primarily associated, is a controversial direction in social science research. This particular approach developed in the 1930s within the flourishing tradition of sociological research stimulated at Chicago as demonstrated by the work of Thomas and Znaniecki (1920), Thrasher (1929), Wirth (1928), Shaw (1930), and Whyte (1955). Soon afterwards it was extensively critiqued – as a tribute to the prevailing modernist tradition, which accused the life history method of failing 'objectivity' tests.

The 1970s were suddenly marked with a 'minor resurgence' of life histories - and 'significantly among deviancy sociologists' (Goodson 1999: 10). Further, life history became a marked feature of postmodernist and poststructuralist research, particularly as evidenced in gender studies, psychology and cultural studies. The wider movement from objectivities to subjectivities, the biographic method found

new venues for its further application. As a result, a large variety of new life history cases began to appear (Denzin 1970; 1994).

As Clifford and Marcus (1986) argue, 'the tradition of the objective observer, and the subsequent power embedded in their representations, where the writer is conspicuously absent from the text', was finally questioned, as well as the concept of objectivity. As Munro (1998: 8) puts it:

The current focus on acknowledging the subjective, multiple and partial nature of human experience has resulted in a revival of life history methodology. What were previously criticisms of life history, its lack of representativeness and its subjective nature, are now its greatest strength.

Thus the most recent application of the biographic method in social sciences is based on interpretative research. This research perspective means 'the study and collection of life documents or documents of life, which describe turning-point moments in individuals' lives' (Denzin 1989: 7). According to Reissman (1993: 2) this methodological approach 'examines the informant's story and analyzes how it is put together'. She looks at biographical research as a multi-level analytical process, calling it 'narrative analysis' or 'narrativization of epiphanies' and thus emphasizing the presence of critical, reflexive memoirs.

As noted by Gudmundsdóttir (2003: 534), narrative biography is a form of qualitative research that takes stories not only as its 'raw data' but also as its 'product'. That is why, Denzin (1989: 7) understands this method as 'interpretative biography' – the 'creation of literary, narrative accounts and representations of lived experiences', which emerge as the final outcome of a biographical project and are referred to by Gudmundsdóttir (2003) as 'narrative portraiture'.

Thus the post-modern life history is supposed to encompass more than just a life course – that is, the mere series of days and events. According to Gudmundsdóttir (2003) and Erben (1998), it is a narrative project as a creative exercise, in which a life story develops in interweaving subjective and objective dimensions in our lives. The dynamics of this interaction stems from the subjective interpretation and appropriation of every day life as it is lived and structured by societal forces that cannot be immediately perceived.

According to Goodson and Sikes (2001), the life course is practically and theoretically perceived as a successive series of complex interactions between an individual (who is himself a product of complex and sometimes contradictory socialisation processes) and 'the reality' of an immediate surrounding world, which is also structured by societal contradictions. It is the subjective appropriation of this interaction that produces life histories. The subject as such is indeed constituted by people who act and think in the course of this interaction and, consequently, leave traces of their individual subjectivity in speech, acts of behaviour and emotions.

In a study that aims to throw light on how individual lives are lived through and in day-to-day contexts, the life history approach and the respondent's insider perspective must complement each other. In order to portray a person, with 'all the nuances of his beliefs, values and aspirations', and to convey 'the authentic flavor of his culture', it seems appropriate to refer to the person's 'biography' or 'life history' (Goodson and Sikes 2001). A vivid example is my case, comprised of the twenty-three Russian academic emigrants and narrated by the émigrés themselves.

Interpretive Logic: Legitimization of Subjectivity or Panoramic Vision through Close-ups

Narrative Biography/Life History and Interpretative Research are two types of Narrative Inquiry – though not always exactly the same. Interpretative Research is based on the analysis of *subjectivity* (Creswell 2007; Czarniawska 2004). As Beeman and Peterson remark, the 'interpretive practice' is a reflection on 'routine procedures, cultural categories and social positions that come together in particular instances' (2001: 159):

Interpretation has long been a central problem for...cultural analysis...A central problem involves exploring how people make sense of the world around them from messy situation to messy situation, managing ambiguity, repairing misunderstandings and negotiating meanings...How do people make sense out of situations in ways that make sense to others? How do they articulate the meanings they derive from the streams of experience around them?

This research mode may be part of focused research and may also be based on narrating a particular episode – not necessarily the whole life. Narrative

Biography is meant to show the *whole social context* around the person's life (May 2001; Silverman 1993).

Narrative Biography aims to demonstrate how the person's life develops in and through its social context and also how her/his life fits and reflects this context. Primarily, Narrative Biography aims to show the whole, whereas the primary purpose of Interpretative Research is to 'say a lot about a little thing' (Silverman 1993: 3) – that is to focus on details and specific moments. These two purposes do not contradict each other. Nevertheless, they do not necessarily always come together in one study. However, when they *do* come together – that is, in Interpretative Biography – they complement each other, as the researcher compares multiple subjectivities along the continuum of a person's life.

In my understanding, Interpretative Biography is a compound research mode, in which Narrative Biography and Interpretative Research interweave into one research pattern, whose purpose is to show how little things constitute the meaning of the whole life.

In other words, in Interpretative Biography – if compared with film – the researcher makes a panoramic vision (of the whole life and the context), then takes a close-up of the most critical moments – as if looking at them under the microscope – and then returns to and polishes the earlier created panorama by showing how these fade-ins, or snapshots, fit it. This is just the general scheme, within which there may be a variety of narrativization strategies and techniques.

It is evident that these two purposes – the interpretative close-up and the biographic panorama – are inter-connected in Interpretative Biography. In interpretative biographies, the researcher takes a close-up of only those moments that are important in the understanding of the whole life. And the researcher interprets the whole life as depending on these close-ups, connecting them logically in order to finish the panoramic image, or the panoramic *gestalt*. Within this compound model, the constituent of Interpretative Research provides the researcher with a number of micro-gestalts that are used to create the macro-gestalt required by Narrative Biography.

For example, the panoramic gestalt of my particular case is the displaced and dislocated Russian academy 'on the rack' – that is, migrating Russian academics in

search of homeland within the shifting contexts of both the (post) Soviet Russian academy and the global *Britamerica*. This gestalt is supported by a variety of crucial fade-ins, such as the first job search, the first gate-keeping experiences, entrance to the PG programme, PhD defence, ethnic conflicts or peculiar circumstances around the emigration decision. At the same time, the respondent chooses to comment upon a particular episode because he thinks this episode will be relevant to understanding his life by both him and me. As M(X) said at the very end of the interview, 'I have not told you more than I thought would be necessary for us to know in order to understand my life. There were many other things, of course. But I think they are irrelevant'.

Looking at people's experiences and how the former make the meaning out of the latter, the interpretative study thus suggests a re-examination of taken-for-granted knowledge (Mezirow 1990). This implies that our knowledge should not be treated as objective truth. However, this perspective does not cancel the objectivity of the data. It means that the objectivity is to be established through a different logical channel. By pinpointing specific locations and suggesting that our perceptions and representations of the world be recognised as historically and culturally specific and contingent, interpretive researchers argue that our identities and worldviews could have been different under different circumstances and that they can change over time (Erben 1998; LeCompte 1993; Mezirow 1990).

Interpretative analysis seeks to understand the meaning of the data from the insight – that is, from the point of view - of the subjects of the research (Burgess 1994; Blaikie 2000). Within the interpretive research framework, the inquiry aims to grasp the meaning rather than to display 'the delineation of causality' (May 2001) - the principle known as the *abductive* research strategy (Mezirow 1990).

Mezirow (1990) defines the logic of interpretative research as 'metaphorically abductive' - or as I would like to state it, 'subjectivity-rich'. According to this logic, by drawing upon our experience, we explain someone else's (Mezirow op cit). We develop our analysis by interpreting what may be the meaning of *their* experiences, as opposed to deduction and induction.

As May (2001) believes, not every meaning can be delivered through 'evident causal relationships', that is, 'deductively'. Distinct from the traditional

hypothetical-deductive logic of positivism (which, indicates what *must* be), the abductive non-conventional logic leads the researcher to understand the inner voice of someone who thinks 'abductively' (May op cit).

In other words, my study aims to de-code very personal meanings and through this cognition to legitimise their subjectivity. It does not mean that these 'subjective' opinions have no logic at all and that the researcher seeks to fabricate the artificial narrative plot. The legitimizing of subjectivity means the understanding and the uncovering of the hidden logic through a different mode of thinking.

The abductive strategy is also different from the inductive strategy. Whereas the deductive mode aims to prove the causal relations within an established theory, the inductive mode of research aims to develop a new theory based on generalizations and propositions. Mezirow (1990) notes that the inductive strategy operates through developing a summary of proven and recognised facts. The ontological assumptions of the induction, as Blaikie (2000: 102) further observes, are about the 'ordered universe that can be represented by universal propositions and generalizations, 'objectively' produced'.

In contrast with induction, the abductive strategy provides the research with the ontological assumption of a socially constructed world within the theoretical perspective of interpretivism (Blaikie 2000). In this respect, the different realities and different interpretations of the participants in the research show that the idea that there is 'a single reality should be rejected in favour of the idea that there may be multiple and changing social realities, that is what the abductive kind of strategy help to arrive at' (op cit). The implication is that there is no independent or neutral way of establishing the 'truth'. Its epistemological assumptions regard social scientific knowledge as being derived from everyday concepts and meanings, or from the socially constructed knowledge.

The interpretative biographic approach is particularly important in studies of academic career for the following reasons. Weiland (1994) points out that in behavioural and social sciences, there is a widespread tradition of addressing the academic career from the Life Span Perspective, originating from the area of Human Development. One of the substantial limitations of this approach is that through its prism 'individual differences are often viewed as the product of "non-normative"

influences on development' (op cit: 85). In the milieu of the globalizing 'runaway' world, this perspective does not work when applied to the academic trans-national career. The problem is that trans-national academics, or academic emigrants, have actually matured and even established themselves in one intellectual environment (that of the giving society) and later moved to another intellectual environment (that of the accepting society). This cultural transition inevitably makes them different from the hosts, whose behaviour has the status of the "norm". If one looked at my informants from the Life Span angle, their immigrant behaviour would remain inexplicable and even nonsensical. That is why my study needs the Whole Life Approach, advised by Weiland (op cit), and interpretative biography is resonant with it.

In this respect, the interpretative biography of academic life can be defined as portraying the 'academic Self' (Weiland 1995: 89). An interesting question is what must be included in the 'academic Self narrativization'. Deriving from the nature of academic life, 'academic individuality' – even including the 'average' faculty career – becomes a 'territory of biographic interpretative research' because it narrates academic culture 'with attention to the smallest but indispensable unit of analysis' (op cit). This narrative fade in, or the narrativization under the microscope, reflects one of the requirements in interpretative research – 'to say a lot about a little thing' (Silverman 1993: 3). Another requirement of this research mode is creating a panoramic vision – that is, portraying the social context around the individual (Coffey 1996; Flyvbjerg 2001). In this reference, Weiland (op cit) notices that 'academic colleagueship is an unavoidable life history theme and part of the structure of the biographical encounter'.

In the conclusive opinion of Weiland (1995: 62), the interpretative biography of academic life leads to 'a complex understanding of academic career – the one that could be assessed in terms of power/knowledge and struggling through and re-creating the social context'.

A processual model of power

Many other scholars, including Mezirow (1991), acknowledge the concepts of 'power' and 'knowledge' as very central in qualitative research. In this

connection, Foucauldians mention the organic 'power-knowledge' ensemble as both transitory and complex. The way we construct our knowledge indicates complex interactions of power in which social relationships of privilege and oppression – the categories that form our identities – develop in unpredictable ways. That explains why issues of power and knowledge have occupied a central position within sociological analysis.

Approaching 'power' Foucault asks, 'How is power exercised?' In more specific terms, his analysis of power is guided by the question 'how is power exercised in specific domains under particular historical conditions?' In this connection, Shiner (1992: 390) legitimately remarks that, to be even more exact, this inquiry should be understood as focusing on "relations of power" rather than on "power" as such. Since these relations pre-suppose a network of complex processes, Foucault's model of power is known as 'relational' or 'processual'. Thus Foucault advises us to examine specific situations that can contribute to or disrupt the exercise of power by groups or individuals. As I understand this processual model, there are certain situations in which people may cease to exercise power and find themselves excluded from the social context of gaming for power. From the anthropological angle, Sennett (1998) writes about discontinuities, or circumstances of life 'disruption', that damage people's identities. Translating Foucault into the language of socio-anthropology, Sennett actually leads us to see that in such situations people with disrupted identities have no access to power. Other anthropologists, including Bateson (1995), Geertz (1983) and Higgins (2001), point to the processes of reconnection – or recovering from the disruption – which, as I understand, help people to resume meanings in their lives and to engage in power relations again. We can see that it is through these situations of discontinuity and reconnection that people negotiate their power and identities. And in this study, I would like to examine these situations as they apply to the changing context of academic work. With reference to this particular context, Bourdieu (1988) – as noted in Chapter 2 – points to the complex 'academic wars' and 'games' over the issue of how to access 'academic power'.

In general terms, Foucault's interrogation of this fundamental question - 'How is power exercised?' - has led to five methodological foci, as summarised below by

Smart (2002: 78) and supported by other Foucauldians: (1) the level of inquiry into power; (2) the effect of power; (3) the form of power; (4) the direction of investigation; and (5) the mechanism, or battery, of power relations.

Firstly, Foucault views power as represented by complex relational processes through which identities are shaped. This level of inquiry suggests the focus on the texture of power rather than on the motivation for it and reveals its contested and chameleonic nature. Secondly, showing the network effect of the power spread, he displays the situational nature of identities constituted through the power relations. Thirdly, the next dimension of his interest in power is its configurations in specific situations – that is, the local and individual techniques of the exercise of power that enable people to become the circumstantial agents of power in their local spaces such as their workplace or neighbourhood. Fourthly, he offers the ascending direction in the analysis of power relations – for example, how a person can reach a powerful position within a certain hierarchy and thus rise to power - with the close-up focus on details of its exercise. Fifthly and finally, Foucault suggests that the mechanism of power relations is based on inter-subjective knowledge about how to exercise power - the so called ‘knowledge effect’ of power.

In detail, Foucault’s inquiry into the texture of power relations conveys *complex relational processes through which identities take shape*. Smart (2002: 136) suggests that we should direct the analysis to ‘the exercise or practice of power, its field of application and its effects’ and not to ‘the questions of possession or conscious intention’. Instead of studying ‘the motivation or interests of groups or individuals in the exercise of domination’, the enquiry ought to move toward ‘the various complex processes through which subjects are constituted as effects of objectifying power’. In other words, researchers are invited to explore *how* people and their lives change rather than *why* the change occurs.

Two general observations can be made about power relations. First, they generically reveal themselves as ‘a kind of “game” or “war” in which each participant and group of participants develops strategies to gain an advantage’ (Shiner 1992: 391). Second, being of the combative nature, power relations are ‘open-textured: they are exercised from innumerable points, not limited to one particular domain; they take a variety of forms’ (Cousins & Hussain 1984: 228). In

The Subject of Power, Foucault (p. 211 as cited in Smart 2002: 135) defines power relations as a series of acts that 'cannot be ascribed to the dynamo of class struggle' such as 'the power of men over women...or of parents over children'. It happens because war generally stirs the creativity of the exercise of power and thus mobilises people's hidden talents or the true nature of their identities

Foucault thus invites us to reflect on the situational nature of identities. In his opinion, 'power is...diffuse' - that is, 'exercised from a variety of points in the social body' (Smart 2002: 122). According to Foucault, "Power relations are both intentional and non-subjective" (op cit). This famous semi-paradoxical statement means that individuals are both the subjects and the objects of power. They 'are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising...power' - depending on the situation and circumstances (Heller 1996: 79). For example, writing about the "faces of oppression" in education, Gewirtz (2002: 142) comments on exploitative practices as Janus-faced - as educators 'are both exploited by others and they represent an exploited group themselves...exploited by those who manage them'. Therefore, educators may 'experience a loss of power...less involved in school decision making' while 'continuing to exercise power on a daily basis over students' and over other educators (op cit). In other words, people are always manipulated and manipulative throughout their life journeys. They can be both disrupted and reconnected, depending on a particular situation.

Here lies the answer to the question, 'How many people are involved in the exercise of power and to what extent?' Foucault (cited in Smart op cit: 123) refers to the "relational capillary qualities" of power. It circulates through the social body, "functions in the form of a chain and is exercised through a net-like organization in which all are caught".

In the light of the circumstantial and net-like nature of power relations, Foucault advises us to study reconfigurations of power and calls for deliberate attention to local and individual techniques of power. Here Foucault takes the question of 'by what means is power exercised?' (Cousins & Hussain 1984: 228). Foucauldians recommend the study of the techniques of power that are 'captured by institutions' and 'colonised by privileged groups' (the anthropologists would call them the techniques of recovery) - the so-called 'power from below', with its

‘multiple forms of subjectivity, including a variety of gender and class experiences’ (Foucault 1979, emphasis added).

For the purposes of precision in examining the ‘capillary fashion’ of these techniques, Foucault focuses on the ‘micro-physics of power’, aimed at revealing particular histories, techniques and tactics of power (Smart 2002: 122). The interpretive research on these particulars reveals the net effect of accumulated knowledge to facilitate the exercise of power.

The ‘knowledge-effect’ perspective on power shows that mechanisms of power have been accompanied by ‘the production of effective instruments for the formation and accumulation of knowledge’, as observed by Smart (2002: 102). In his opinion, ‘The intelligibility of power derives...from the fact that relations of power are pervaded by calculation, and by aims and objectives’ (op cit: 123). Here Foucault particularly focuses on the ‘inter-subjectively accepted knowledge about how to exercise power’ (Fox 1998: 416). This intersubjectivity is understood as the ‘common-sense, shared meanings constructed by people in their interactions with each other and used as an everyday resource to interpret the meaning of elements of social and cultural life’ (Fox op cit). As Weiland (1995: 89) remarks, ‘Culture is the name we give to the cumulative meanings of similar narratives by members of a group’. He thinks of ‘culture’ as the ‘narrative accrual’ (a term he borrows from Bruner). Thus in Foucault’s philosophy, the concepts of ‘power’ and ‘culture’ are linked together and mediated by the concept of ‘intersubjectivity’ or ‘common knowledge’. In this context, power emerges as a complex relationship based on knowledge and culture: culture shapes intersubjectivity (that is knowledge), which leads to power (a powerful position or relationship). An example of this relationship can be found in diasporic cultures, described in studies of immigrant identity (Clifford 1994; Levy & Weinrod 2005; Pattie 2005) and later in my research (in Chapter 7).

It is important to remember that Foucault introduces the duet ‘power-knowledge’ – ‘a phenomenon that cannot be reduced simply to either component’, as observed by Fox (1998: 416). Developing the ‘power-knowledge’ concept in *History of Sexuality*, Foucault demonstrates that power is based on knowledge and makes use of knowledge. As I see it, it is the lack or absence of knowledge that makes people

feel 'non-placed' (Auge's 1995) or 'disconnected', in situations of life 'discontinuity' (Higgins 2001).

As evident, Foucault looks at power relations as complex and open-textured processes, through which people's identities take shape - the identities that are also open-textured, very situational and circumstantial due to the diffuse nature of power. Therefore, we should pay particular attention to individual techniques of power, personal details of power manipulation and the local contexts of struggling for power. Besides, all these factors go side by side with the application of knowledge by the power agents. It is evident that Foucault's processual, or relational, conception of power is linked with the issue of identity formation and the phenomenon referred to as 'knowledge-power'.

Foucault's interest in how people seek power can be taken as a suggestion to set the general research question for my inquiry: how did it happen that (help me to understand by what route) you have arrived in here? What was your journey through? This mobility-focused, or Odyssey-centred, inquiry is the nucleus for interpretative research because through reflecting on this route a new identity shapes. The processual approach is helpful to me in analysing my informants' lives and aspirations in the new context of their lives – that of exile. This understanding of power suggests *a bond with interpretative research* in approaching this concept.

My research

Topic and purpose

The *topic* of my interpretive biographic research is *the careers and identities of academic emigrants from Soviet and post-Soviet Russia*, as I have already mentioned in the introduction. The *purpose* is to explore the identities of Russian academics in the West and to understand what the former mean for the latter.

Initially I intended to conduct a feminist study under the title 'Women's experiences of being a Professor in Russia: Grounded theory of their perseverance'. The aim was to investigate the nature of women professors' experiences in Russia, the meanings women assigned to those experiences, and via that information to provide a snapshot of the factors that facilitated the diligence and persistence of women who followed the path towards the professor position. The chosen case was

University teachers across a range of disciplines who had received the Russian Doctoral Degree and occupied the Professor position at the Ryazan State Pedagogical University, the place of my undergraduate and employment affiliation, all in all, for fifteen years.²⁸

Throughout my Russian career, I had been teaching and professionally coordinating mostly women, as they constitute approximately 90% of the student body and 80% of faculty contingent in Russian Pedagogical Universities. Because the majority of our professoriate are women with families from various ethnic and social backgrounds, I was keen on exploring their career paths, full of arduous trials, in order to highlight ways of improving their labour conditions and strategies for attracting more women to the academic profession.

With that purpose in mind, I decided to conduct a pilot study among Russian academics residing in the UK and the US. The purpose of that preliminary research effort was to undertake a trial investigation of the notions of Russianness and mobility among those Russian academics who were within easy geographical reach as well as to test the narrative biographic method.

Having browsed the websites of the University of Edinburgh, Napier University and Heriott-Watt University in search of Russian names, I e-mailed approximately fifteen people about my research intent. Almost all of them agreed to participate in my study. I started to talk with them face-to-face using the convergent interview technique. In order to get more diverse responses, I then decided to expand the sample globally by employing the phone interview strategy. With that pursuit in mind, I continued to browse the staff directories of Universities outside Edinburgh, including those in Scotland, England and the United States. Having e-mailed twenty more people, I met the same positive response from half of them and obtained data from the new participants by telephone. That pilot study took place in May-August 2005.

²⁸ An average Russian city, Ryazan has a population of 500,000 people and boasts a variety of higher education institutions. One of them is the Ryazan State Pedagogical University (RSPU), founded in December 1915. Enrolling 8,000 students at the moment, it is a home of 9 faculties and 45 departments. The University employs 460 instructors, including 76 Professors. For more detail, refer to the RSPU website: <http://www.rspu.ryazan.ru>

In this tracking of the respondents' Soviet career paths I noticed a responsive feedback on their perception of the Russian academia and understood that this topic should be examined from the emigrant perspective. Most of these people were victims of political and economic pressures. Deeply offended by the Soviet regime, they shared episodes of administrative and political violence and ethnic discrimination – those small details of our everyday life that eventually destroyed the image of the Soviet academy. Reckless of consequences, they introduced me to painful experiences of their professional and everyday humiliation. I was especially disturbed and arrested by the stories of Russian Jewish academics – the accounts of their intellectual genocide and survival. Listening to their narratives, I realised that the respondents could not be so frank if interviewed in Russia.

I decided, therefore, to change the focus of my research for the following reasons. Firstly, I understood that the academic stories abounded in sensitive issues that would inevitably cast a shadow on work places in Russia. I had not thought about that before. I felt that I would not be able to conduct research in my Alma Mater because I had been too much involved in it for several years, first as a student and then as a teacher. Therefore, I suspected myself of growing more and more dislocated from 'objectivity'. The initial proposal turned into a rather sensitive issue for me. Secondly, the responses from Russian academics in emigration made it clear that academic people were eager to tell the truth as they understood it only when they were disconnected from Russia. Thirdly, I found myself extremely keen on entering the newly shaping domain of my potential research mostly because I had been caught up in the issue of Russian exile myself and wanted to write about it.

Case and its sensitivity

My research centres on *twenty-three* academics residing in the UK and the USA. The participants are ranked from recent PhD holders to Full Professor, within the age range of 30-70, having left Russia within the time span of twenty years (from late 1970-s to the late 1990s).²⁹ The sample is *purposefully random*, that is both *random* and *purposefully selected*, including a small degree of snowballing methods, when two participants in the pilot study advised me to get in touch with their

²⁹ The demographic information on the participants is summarized in Charts 3-5.

colleagues either from the same scientific school or from mutual Soviet projects. However, most participants were selected without any initial awareness of their intercollegiate connections. Following Patton's (1990: 183) advice - as cited in Leichtentritt (2004: 353) - I wanted my sample to be 'information rich' or to embrace people originating from various geographical localities within Russia and now residing in a variety of places across the English-speaking world. The major aim of *the purposeful selection* was to involve people from diverse educational and professional backgrounds within the broad field of Russian higher education, such as low-, middle- and high-level University instructors and researchers from diverse academic domains and with employment records from diverse academic and educational institutions. However, the majority of interviewees were chosen *at random* among those who eagerly responded to my invitation. The respondents were interviewed, mostly in two sessions, by face-to-face and telephone interviews varying in length from one hour and a half to three hours.

The pilot study revealed two kinds of ethical problem: my inquiry into sensitive topics and the participants' concern about anonymity (May 2001).³⁰ The former involved sharing sensitive issues such as questions about ethnicity, especially about Jewishness;³¹ conflicts at work; and material conditions in Russia. For many people such experiences are 'emotion-laden memories' (Bauer 2003: 28) of 'traumatic and random events' (Rechson & Becker 2005: 107). These 'paralysed stories' (Rechson & Becker 2005: 107) are usually associated with life 'on the margins of society' and episodes of violence (Merrill 2002). As Bauer (2003) observes, this kind of anxiety is more common in male respondents, whose dominant status and, consequently, masculinity are challenged. Therefore, exploration of such questions needs to be carefully thought about in advance and conducted only after rapport is well established.

The respondents' lack of familiarity with and fear of the unstructured 'post-positivist' interview had derived from the previously closed nature of Soviet society and meant that they must be concerned about the consequences of confidential in-depth talk. This challenge involved additional preparation for interviews that needed

³⁰ For more information on the pilot study, see Chart 2.

³¹ The information on the Jewish participants is summarized in Chart 5.

to include such procedures as thorough explanation of the research purpose to the respondents and careful, step-by-step, rapport establishment both before and in the course of the interviews. A very important step in this direction was a very descriptive invitation-for-research letter sent out by my supervisor to my informants. A firm guarantee of the protection of confidentiality, the letter was immediately mailed for the second time during the interviewing process if a participant had any doubts about the indicated ethical standards.

With the informant's permission, the interviews were recorded and accompanied with simultaneous note taking to assist on-going queries in an adequate manner. All the respondents had eagerly given their consent to the recording and note taking procedures. None of the interviewees viewed those measures as a psychological constraint that might damage the flow of the intercourse.

The informants appear in the text under code names consisting of two letters. The first letter in the series is either M or F, related to a person's gender (*male* or *female*). The second letter (in brackets) is specific for each informant. For example, the informants' names may be M(X) or F(Z), the former referring to a male participant and the latter referring to a female. None of the letters in brackets coincides with the informant's real initials, in order to further protect the identity of informants.

Gestalt mosaicing: researcher's role and data collection

The major dilemma arising in interpretative research is abstraction versus rapport – or generating valuable data versus managing a communicative relationship with the informant. What should be sacrificed - the researcher-respondent reciprocity for the sake of the detached listening, or vice versa?

There are three ways to collect qualitative data: structured interviews, semi-structured interviews, and unstructured (or convergent) ones. The choice of a particular technique needs to be very individualised - reflecting the interviewing manner, the working relationship with the respondent and, consequently, the intensity of the respondent's reflexivity within and on the collected data. Of course, the reasons for employing these different interview categories are substantially different.

Whereas *structured* interviews aim to capture 'precise data of a codable nature in order to explain behaviour within pre-established categories ... [the unstructured interview] is used in an attempt to understand the complex behaviour of members of society without imposing any a priori categorization that may limit the field of inquiry' (Fontana and Frey 1994: 366). Unstructured interviews have the advantage of situating any prior conceptions held by the researcher in the background and giving priority to the participants' own conceptions of their experiences. The disadvantage of an unstructured interview format is that lack of a specific focus may tend to produce a great deal of material that may not be closely connected with the research questions. With time at a premium, the unstructured interview may not make the best use of this limited resource. However, this was not the case in my research.

In the most conventional format - that of the structured interview, the traditional role of the researcher as interviewer has been one of an interested, but affectively detached observer who plays 'a neutral role ... on the one hand, casual and friendly but, on the other hand directive and impersonal' (Fontana and Frey 1994: 364).

However, in recent years researchers have questioned whether such objectivity is even possible. The underlying, taken-for-granted, assumptions of excluding certain very personal traits such as sensitivity and emotionality have been significantly questioned (Fontana and Frey 1994: 370). LeCompte (1993: 11-12) suggests that 'positivistic science imposes a false distance between researchers and the researched by mandating that the researcher maintain an artificially impersonal stance toward the people studied' and that this detached perspective results 'in data that present a partial and therefore false, and an elitist and therefore biased, reality'.

Positivists may argue that the researcher's involvement breaks the authenticity of the data. In response to this opinion, LeCompte (op cit) believes that it is the relationship between the researcher and the informant that actually preserves the narrative authenticity. Moreover, she further notices that there is neither authenticity nor validity when informants are placed in a position distanced or subordinate to that of the researcher.

In my research I share the viewpoint of LeCompte (op cit), who sees the researcher's role as that of a 'mediator who assists participants in giving voice to their own thoughts and understanding to the events and circumstances in the larger context of their own lives'. In this connection, my interview style can be described as reflective and based on the development of rapport with the participants. Related to the issues of mediation and reflexivity, there is another challenging issue - the number of interview sessions.

How many interviews are necessary and enough to gather the most comprehensive information and also to keep it authentic? Some biographic researchers – those who advocate the strategy of abstraction from very personal socialization with informants - warn against repeated interviews with the same respondent. However, in his 'Biographic Narrative Interpretative Minimum' (known as the BNIM technique) Wengraf (2001) recommends the delivery of interviews in two or three sessions, first asking the person to tell the story of his life in the creative manner. The story is supposed to start from any point the informant selects and to flow without being interrupted. Right afterwards the informant is asked to clarify certain episodes from his narrative. During the final session more structured questions may be asked. Wengraf insists on not asking the same question to the same person more than once in order to preserve the *gestalt* or the image designed by the storyteller. Thus the researcher's abstraction is bound to the preservation of the *gestalt*.

Much of the interpretative research is, nevertheless, characterised by *multiple interviews* because they help to develop truly strong interviewer-interviewee bonds (Reinharz 1992: 36). Multiple interviews, which often cover far more than just three brief sessions, are likely to be more comprehensive and accurate than single interviews because of the opportunity to ask additional questions and to get corrective feedback on previously obtained information. Multiple open-ended interviews are well suited to understanding how a person develops his ideas. They can be conducted, however, only with interviewees who have *time to invest* in the process (Reinharz 1992: 37-38). The *gestalt* is thus not broken apart but is constantly *mosaiced* and *re-mosaiced* throughout the process. To re-create the 'fugitive' *gestalt*, researchers efficiently look for a variety of unconventional ways while

experimenting with narrative portraiture – which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Thus the use of *semi-structured* and *unstructured* interviews has become the principal means by which researchers seek to achieve the active involvement of their respondents in the construction of data about their lives (Bologh 1984: 388). However, it is also important to say that the un-structured interview is *a very broad method of data collection*, which may include a variety of specifications, depending on the research-interviewee relationship. To be more specific, I would also define the unstructured and semi-structured interviews I have conducted as *phenomenological interviews*. Phenomenological interviewing is often described as an ‘interviewee-guided investigation of a lived experience that asks almost no prepared questions. Phenomenological interviewing requires interviewer skills of restraint and listening as well as interviewees who are verbal and reflexive’ (Reinharz 1992: 21)

To be more precise, the method I employ here was borrowed from Kerlin (1995) and defined by her as a *phenomenological process*, which begins with people’s experiences and relies heavily on the willingness of the former to talk extensively about the latter.

Interviews began with open-ended questions that were intended to provide a broad structure for the participants' stories. When listening to their stories, I kept developing further questions using the participants' own language, to garner additional detail and clarification of their meanings and intents. I used the language of the participants so as to avoid naming their experiences for them. Through active listening – and through written responses that actively engaged with their issues and ideas - I made every effort to provide an atmosphere of engagement and trust which allowed participants to develop ideas and construct meaning, to share attitudes and feelings which typically are not quantifiable and usually are missed in survey and structured interview research.

Using narration as a method of inquiry and delivering this phenomenological process, my intention was to guide participants, with a minimum of direction, in the telling of their stories, and to encourage deeper levels of reflection and analysis without limiting or restricting their focus. The phenomenological interview format – which, in fact, means the semi-structured interview - was situated between the two

extremes of the structured and unstructured interview and although this approach may require a greater length of time than a structured interview, it has the advantage of allowing the participants to raise new issues and concerns that I, as a researcher, had not conceptualised as being pertinent.

Data analysis

The narrative study of any lives inevitably reflects the *conditions* of particular domains of human activity. Presenting my findings, I offer narrative portfolios of the *subjects* – in the form of detailed biographical profiles of six academics from Russia – complemented with a thematic analysis of the remaining seventeen stories – as a form of inquiry into academic work and life.³² The narrative is framed by a brief discussion of the six academic life histories and then a longer, composite biographic discussion addressing practical and theoretical problems in understanding faculty careers drawing on sociological and cultural geographical perspectives.

Resonating with Reissman's (1993) and Toolan's (2001) modes of narrative representation, my analytical scenario was the following. The overall analytical and interpretative pattern largely relies upon thematic analysis and partial linguistic analysis of repeated and stressed words, prosody such as pauses and intonation and, where possible, non-verbal means of communication such as complexion changes and mimicry (Reissman 1993). The recorded interviews were initially transcribed in Russian and consequently translated into English. The translated text was 're-transcribed' with some prosodic symbols to indicate the participants' specific emotions such as laughter, sadness and tense pauses.³³ The 're-transcription' was based on Labov's (1972; 1982) method, as described by Reissman (1993: 59), in order 'to see how simple narratives are organised'. The analytical strategies of 'memoing' and 'coding' were applied to the final transcription version and constituted the first step in thematic analysis for the purposes of theme differentiation (May 2001). Then I followed the advice of Toolan (2001: 17-21) and supplemented a more thorough thematic and categorization-based analysis with Propp's morphology, applied to certain themes. On Reissman's (1993: 34-60) recommendation, I

³² This approach is recommended by Weiland (1995), who consistently writes narrative biographies of academic lives.

³³ See Appendices A and B present for the interview transcript examples.

experimented with the poetical structural approach by Gee, aiming to create a thought provoking and 'analytically poetic text' (op cit: 26). Thus consistent with this approach, some of the text mirrors the representation manner in Bluebond-Langner's (1978) anthropological study. This analytical framework offers the opportunity to explore and present people's meanings from their own perspectives and in their own 'language'. It is especially important in writing about sensitive issues such as anti-Semitism and other forms of oppression.

Experimenting with interpretive research: narrative structure of a sensitive case

In this section, I would like to focus on my experimentation with narrative portraiture and to suggest the *composite autobiography*, or the *analytical play*, as an alternative form of interpretative biography. I argue that this form of narrativization is one of the most efficient means of developing a story because it displays processes of social identity formation and creates the most reflexive and coherent image. To illustrate this project, I draw on the reminiscences of Russian academics in emigration about their perception of anti-Semitism in Moscow in the 1960-1980s.

Composite autobiography can be understood as an experiment with narrative portraiture in order to deliver the story as the final product of the highly popular biographical method. This idea was tested in medical anthropology by Bluebond-Langner (1978). Having interviewed dying children, their parents and the hospice medical staff, she presented their voices in a hospital room drama. I would like to show the importance of the contribution composite autobiography can make in exploring a sensitive issue and to illustrate this form of narrative portraiture with a specific case – that of Soviet anti-Semitism.

As I have already mentioned, the story as such becomes central in narrative research. In this connection, Reissman (1993) remarks that the story undergoes several rounds of narrative analysis before becoming the *final* story. However, there are no precise rules for interpreting qualitative data (Coffey, 1996; Silverman, 1993). In the opinion of Reissman, detailed interpretation of narrative accounts is sometimes less powerful and less meaningful than the narrative portraiture itself, especially in

the case of very reflexive and sensitive biographies. The question is what form the reflexive narrative portraiture can take.

Gudmundsdóttir (2003) mentions two basic ways of narrating a story – conventional narrative, or biography, and experimental narrative, or autobiography:

Biography has a historical third-person narrator and the progression of events in causal relation to one another toward closure... Conventional narrative, it tells the story from childhood up to the time of writing the biography in a more or less chronological order... it could be a fragmented text about fragmented life (op cit: 147).

An unlimited space for experimentation and representation of oppressed voices has been offered by *autobiography*, which is also recognised as ‘meta-autobiographical’ (or meta-analytical) because it tells the story not only of the narrator’s life but also of *how* this story has come into existence (Gudmundsdóttir, 2003). The narrated story represents the respondent’s overall construction of his past and future with the purpose of seeing how his interview ‘imposes order on the flow of experience to make sense of events and action in his life’ (op cit). Respondents ‘narrativise particular experiences in their lives, often where there has been a breach between ideal and real, self and society’ (Reissman, 1993: 2). In the opinion of Denzin (1989: 7), writing in the autobiographical manner is the process of ‘inscribing and creating a life’. The reflexivity makes autobiography ‘a rich source of knowledge’ (Sharkley 2004: 498).

The past and the present – the two temporal levels found in any narrative research – ‘meet in the autobiographical text in an *ingenious* way’ (Gudmundsdóttir, 2003: 62). Thus overshadowing the traditional *fabula*, the *sjuzet* – or distinctive narrative pattern - becomes a key feature of autobiography (op cit: 59).³⁴ This analytical process – related to developing *sjuzet* through the original interlinking of different temporalities – is meant to preserve the narration as based on authentic images:

Precisely because they are essential meaning-making structures, narratives must be preserved - not fractured - by investigators, who

³⁴ Gudmundsdóttir (2003: 59) mentions two key elements in the narrative text: *fabula* or disposition (the chronology of the recounted events) and *sjuzet* or composition (the *order* in which these events are recounted).

must respect respondents' ways of constructing meaning and analyze how it is accomplished (Reissman, 1993: 3).

Sjuzet creation becomes especially important in narrating 'stories of oppression', with episodes of violence that remain a series of traumatic and random fragments (Merrill 2002). The composite autobiography - the analytical play, comprised of the voices of different peoples speaking about themselves - is meant therefore to embed these 'isolated experiences' into a 'coherent, meaningful context' (Gudmundsdóttir, 2003).

Though narrative biographies are intrinsically '*collective* in terms of life experiences such as ethnicity or class' (Sharkely, 2004: 498), researchers 'rarely make the connection between the individual and the collective, the private and the public' (Merrill, 2002: 1). Regarding this, the composite autobiography efficiently preserves the 'social identity aspect', mentioned by Altheit (1992: 199) as a requirement for narrative portraiture – according to which 'private constructions typically mesh with a community of life stories, deep structures about the nature of life itself' (Reissman, 1992: 1).

In addition, the analytical play is what Griffiths (1995: 70) defines as '*critical autobiography*' – the 'process of reflecting and re-thinking, which includes attention to politically situated perspectives'. Different actors complement each other by answering each other's questions and narrate the same anecdotes from different angles. Thus composite autobiography becomes a *multi-angular biographical project*, which allows the researcher to construct the most complete, comprehensive and memorable image of the respondent's life.

The information-rich and authentic autobiographical text by no means suggests that the final story be identical to the raw data. Presupposing a highly creative and analytical approach, autobiography is to be scrupulously constructed by the researcher (Gudmundsdóttir, 2003). In this connection, *narrative structure* is of prime importance for the way in which the researcher establishes causality and meaning in the life-story. Based on 'what the subject considers biographically relevant', the autobiographical researcher (the one who presents somebody else's autobiography as the narrative portraiture) must 'develop thematic links between

various experiences' to show what factors influence the subject's 'personal interpretation of the meaning of life' (Rosenthal, 1993: 62):

Human agency and imagination determine what gets included and excluded in narrativization, how events are plotted and what they are supposed to mean. How individuals construct their histories – what they emphasise and omit, their stance as protagonists or victims, the relationship the story establishes between teller and audience – all shape what individuals can claim of their own lives (op cit: 2).

Cyclops' Cave, the play presented in Appendix D,³⁵ consists of two acts, each constructed with a particular purpose and in the form of 'dialogical polyphony' (Flyvbjerg's 2001: 139). Act 1 is a *soloist performance supported with some accompaniment*. At the narrative centre is the informant named Narrator. Her story is the most insightful among my data. It covers all the phases of and events relevant to post-WW2 Soviet anti-Semitism, such as the Jewish camouflage (the surname switch after the Doctors' Plot in 1952), rejection of post-graduate admission and academic career obstruction from 1968 onwards and the 1978 Jewish emigration wave.³⁶ Her autobiography is also the most critical, in terms of providing a lot of factual information. She embodies the most typical case of the Soviet Jew of the third generation.³⁷ Her story thus becomes the solo, complemented with snapshot evidence from other respondents' anecdotes.

Act 1 presents the chronology of Narrator's Soviet Jewish life. Throughout this record she persistently seeks to understand the reason for her elimination by the anti-Semitic Dean. Act 2 offers a discussion on this issue, in which other Jewish voices are confronted with those of anti-Semites. However, the question asked by Narrator remains open, as evident from the final lines.

The autobiographical pattern of Act 2 emerges as the *ensemble*, with the leading duet of M(O) and Cyclops (from Joyce's *Ulysses* – one of the most challenging and experimental works using the composite autobiography as the narrative portraiture and touching upon the issue of anti-Semitism). The two-voice melody of M(O) and Cyclops was selected as the narrative centre because of their

³⁵ *Cyclops Cave* is the second, abridged, version of the play. For the first version of the play, see Appendix C.

³⁶ See Gitelman et al. (2001) and Low (1990).

³⁷ See Gitelman et al. (2001) and Slezkine (2004).

overt anti-Semitic views (described by Sartre in 1970) - the case of reversed reflexivity or the Cyclops' intellectual blindness.

This particular combination of fact and fiction and the frequent general 'representation of ethnographic data in artistic form' in the narrative portraiture have been recently conceptualised by O'Neill (2002: 70) as 'ethno-mimesis'. Ethno-mimesis is a new, yet highly, recommended direction in interpretive research as it offers a variety of ways to experiment with narrative portraiture (Jones 2006; Paget 1990; Wallach 2006). O'Neill (op cit: 69), who has coined the term, introduces this approach as a 'renewed methodology for social research in order to explore and represent the complexity of lived relations in contemporary society'. She herself creates the ethno-mimetic 'written performance' of prostitutes' lives through the use of photographs and also advocates other possible ethno-mimetic models (op cit). Other researchers (though they themselves may even not realise it) frequently use such an ethno-mimetic tool as the 'ethnographic theatre' (O'Neill op cit) and write 'ethno-dramas' of dying children (Bluebond-Langner 1978), a woman struggling with cancer (Paget 1990) or drug addicts (Mienczakowski as mentioned in O'Neil op cit). My *Cyclops' Cave* is another example – an attempt to create the ethno-drama of anti-Semitism. Because it makes 'the reader "re-feel" what historical actors felt' (Wallach 2006: 449), the researchers recognise the powerful potential of ethno-drama in narrating strong emotions. Thus the ethno-dramatic imagery is a possible way to construct the rich interpretive story of a sensitive issue.

Conclusion

Considering the overall sensitivity of my case (described in the previous chapter) and the necessity to develop rapport, I have chosen the method of *interpretative biography*, whose main features may be described as follows, pertaining specifically to my research:

- ❖ legitimization of subjectivity or subjective richness through the metaphorical abduction of interpretative research;
- ❖ multiple semi-structured and time-unlimited interviews;

- ❖ phenomenological interviews, which can be defined as a complex phenomenological process; and
- ❖ experimentation with gestalt mosaicing techniques, including the composite autobiography (or dialogical polyphony).

These are the processes, both methodological and 'analytical' (Flyvbjerg 2001), through which I have accessed the data and through which I will bring forward the findings and their discussion in the on-going chapters.

Chapter 5. Findings: Academic career chronicle

Introduction

To understand academic mobility in its trans-national context, it is important to begin with the most basic facts and chronologies that constitute this context. That is why this chapter focuses on the temporal representation of the academic trans-national career. What are the most interesting stories among the twenty-three narratives? What do individual stories actually tell us about the people? To what extent are these stories different from each other? What commonalities do they share?

It is really hard to say which stories deserve the most of my attention here as specifically portrayed because each of them is very unique and together all of them create the picture of a coordinated academic life in the trans-national context. The stories below portray six of the most contradictory and the most diverse cases of academic career in emigration among my informants, accompanied with brief analysis of their career trajectories, in order to give the reader a general idea of how the trans-national academic career may develop in the context of transitional Russia. In these 'individual' presentations, I wanted to include both men and women from different age groups and different scientific domains. Though in this particular study, I do not distinguish between the trans-national experiences of academic women and men or between the manifestations of the academic trans-nationalism in different academic areas – I think this information will still be useful in our understanding of who they are and to what extent they may be different from each other. The analysis of their career trajectories focuses on the phenomenon of the 'academic Eden exile', related to the years of the informants' undergraduate studies and frequently mentioned in literatures. (I will return to the 'academic paradise' theme in Chapter 7 and develop it from the socio-anthropological angle, as I promised earlier in Chapter 1.)

Based on these academic biographies, Chapter 5 will later create the collective academic biography (or the coordinated academic life) and analyse specific trends and phases in the academic career chronicle, such as (a) motivation

for entering and staying in the academic profession; (b) pre-emigration track; and (c) post-emigration career.

And now welcome to the first story - that of F(X), who sees herself as the 'dissident' and 'the daughter of Aaron' putting all of her pride and despair into this self-identification.

Individual stories and career trajectories

The story of F(X): Cinderella and dissident

F(X) was sixty-three at the moment of the interview. She was born on the Russian periphery – in an industrial town in the Ural Mountains, where she spent her entire childhood and adolescence. She grew up in a very working-class neighbourhood, which is very typical for a town like this. Ernest Hemingway would call it *The Indian Camp*; where 'every other man is dead drunk, lying on the road every weekend', as F(X) mentions. That was the culture of her neighbourhood. In that neighbourhood it was not easy to be different from the majority – that of the very low educated Russian working class. And because F(X) was half Jewish and everyone in her neighbourhood knew the ethnicity of her father Aaron, she was treated very badly by her peers at school. This is what she remembers about her adolescence:

When I was thirteen, my classmates were absolutely anti-Jewish and they were teasing me all the time. When I was walking home from school past the alehouse, there was almost always someone who shouted at me, 'Kike! Filthy Yid!'

She felt really sad (but no more), having developed a sort of immunity to verbal offence; and kept telling herself that childhood does not last forever and that she would escape very soon to a big city with a high culture and a higher level of meritocracy. Thus in her imagination she turned into a buccaneer who was eager to invade a new territory, where everyone was equal and intellectual. Her standpoint led to an obsession with surviving through this buccaneering. And this is what actually helped her to go through all those 'traumatic' years 'relatively easily' and to remain 'normal'.

At the same time, she 'fell madly in love' with the English language as early as in middle school. She had a very poor teacher but she started to love this subject just because its mastery promised an entirely new world – that of a high culture, associated with places so different from her childhood neighbourhood. As a teenager, she started to dream that through affiliation with the English language she would escape, though at that stage she did not yet know precisely in what way it would be accomplished. Yet she decided to master English and begged her parents to hire a private tutor. They found her a true expert from among the post-revolutionary repatriates. It was not difficult because her native town was adjacent to Kharbin, the centre of Russian emigration in China.

At the age of fourteen, she realised that there were a couple of high-ranking universities in Moscow. And because she was always ambitious, she targeted those places as her first choice. She was afraid that her parents would not support her 'emancipation project' and secretly initiated a correspondence with the Moscow Linguistic University, enquiring about the application procedures and admission criteria. The uncomfortable silence around their communication seemed to last for a long time. However, months later they eventually responded with a full letter. She had a choice of applying either to the Department of Translation, with a prospect of becoming a KGB spy; or to the Department of Language Instruction, with a prospect of becoming a University teacher. Having weighed all pros and cons, she arrived at the decision that she wanted to be an academic, though she did not precisely understand the details of that track. What kept her attached to that decision was a possibility of studying her favourite subject in the most prestigious academic place and to become an intellectual.

She was sixteen (the final year of high school) when she tried to discuss it with her parents. They strongly objected for the following reasons. Firstly, they did not believe that she could manage to get a pass there because she was not from the working class. Neither did they have any connections in Moscow. It was 1960 and in that Thaw year Nikita Khrushchev issued the *Stazhnik* Law - a new landmark decision on Soviet higher education about the admission privileges to people with working class records. She evidently did not match that category. Secondly, her parents did not take a look at the academic profession seriously and wanted her to

follow their own example and become an engineer, who could easily find a job in her native town. In other words, the parent identification factor did not work in her favour. Still she emerged through that pressure surprisingly steadily for her young age and did apply to the chosen school.

Having not passed in 1960 because of the *Stazhnik* Law, she had no choice but to return to her hometown and to start working at a heavy machinery plant. Her parents found 'a very clean, white-collar job of a secretary in a good office' for her but she decided to be fully Soviet, close to the Soviet tradition, in order to deserve a place in the Soviet academic hierarchy.

For the next two years she kept applying to the same university and was denied admission for the same reason. At the same time, she stayed in correspondence with a variety of Moscow institutions, enquiring about the best college option and finally decided on the Moscow State University, the Department of Romano-German Philology (RomGer, for short) because it offered a more humanistic and literature-oriented programme of study. Promising to challenge her intellectually, the RomGer attracted her as offering the perfect path towards intellectualism and emancipation. Approximately at the age of nineteen she realised that she wanted to be Professor of English Philology because 'it was what she was cut out for'. Between high school and matriculation, she had worked at a plant in her *Indian Camp* and in the radio centre, which was a 'stupid, noddy job' – '*sharashka*'.³⁸ To prove that she was really Soviet she kept picking up 'really dreadful jobs'. As she mentions, it was 'the spirit of the Thaw, when capable young people were not afraid of any hardships and did believe in the grand future'. She perceived herself as one of such reviving and rebelling intellectuals:

With an English book in my hand and with an air of importance, I was passing by those always drunk workers during our lunch breaks. They were profoundly shocked and I was really amused!

Finally she got to the RomGer in 1963 – at her fourth application attempt - having fallen into the working class (*stazhnik*) category herself because by that time she had already held three years of working-class experience. She enjoyed her studentship. In her opinion, that was 'the best time in her life' – the years having

³⁸ '*Sharashka*' (Russian) means 'a noddy job'.

enriched her with a 'truly Renaissance experience of emancipation' through dissident literary circles. She was 'lucky to have two remarkable teachers' ('Mrs A', her college tutor, and 'Professor B', her research advisor) who impacted upon her entire life even years after University. That was the beginning of a 'remarkable and lifelong friendship between intellectuals' – the friendship that 'survived through the communist ideology and the Brezhnev era', the friendship that 'tested the communist waters'. Under the supervision of Professor B, F(X) wrote her undergraduate qualifying paper in the area of the History of the English Language ('one of the very few areas free from Soviet ideology') and Professor B started to look at F(X) as a future PG student. At the same time, Mrs A recommended her as a faculty member to the department, which was expanding.

In her junior years, she had an affair with a cohort fellow, who was her 'very bosom friend' but from a privileged background in Moscow. And then it all 'cracked' because she felt his parents were against a province girl who was three years older than their son. That is why they broke up, 'remaining friends', however. Afterwards the old wound still hurt for a long time.

As a senior student, she later married another course fellow and was expecting a baby at the time of her graduation. Her future seemed cloudless and pre-determined: a very happy Soviet family, motherhood, a desired academic job, post-graduate school, and eventually a professorship.

However, after the University 'everything was quite trivial', when she 'looks back on it' now. The nightmares of her childhood started to recur – only in a different and more striking way now. She graduated in 1968, when 'the political atmosphere in the country was truly abominable. You could feel very frank anti-Semitism in the air, the naked anti-Semitism in its ugly configurations'.

She was 'left in an uncertain condition, as if hanging in the air', as she herself recalls below:

I could not go to the postgraduate school, as I was not able to start the required intensive course work because of the baby. And I could not work at the Department either because he [the anti-Semitic Dean] did not accept me. I had no choice but to seek employment at a fly-by-night agency at the Ministry of Higher Education.

Her on-line boss was the posh guy's father, who was a 'lickspittle, always dancing on his tiptoes'. To compensate for the earlier emotional loss, he came to her rescue and recommended her for that job. They worked in that Information Centre in 1968-1970 under the central supervision of a KGB colonel, who was a 'complete imbecile'. Her duties included translating newspaper articles that 'were later filed up on the colonel's desk'.

In 1970 she attempted to apply for the postgraduate school again. And because of her ethnicity, she 'was openly being eliminated on the entrance examination, as the teachers had been given the order to lower her grade to 'B' – the mark that would not allow' her to enter the PG daytime programme. That is why she entered the extra-mural track, staying in her 'stupid, noddy job'.

Because her ex-boyfriend (who had dumped her), was also Jewish, he later had the same problem himself. A talented philologist, he got a very marginal position after the elimination from the PG entrance and died several years later from a heart attack. F(X) suffered a lot and she probably still does. However, she was much stronger than him, having emerged not only through that affair but also through the regime's attempt to destroy her academic career.

In 1970 she left her 'senile' job at the Information Centre and started working as a technical translator for another agency. She had worked in that job for another one year and a half before she began teaching at the Moscow State University (MSU) in 1972, the 'prime of the Brezhnev era'. Thus she obtained an English instructor position at the MSU, at the faculty of journalism, which was 'really a very prestigious job'. She taught students who were going to become international journalists³⁹.

In 1975 her son went to primary school, where he was humiliated by the 'dumb' teacher, who could not bear his independent mind - the 'anti-Soviet mentality', always supported by F(X) and her husband. Her seven-year-old son kept asking questions about Soviet double thinking and she was afraid that Soviet lies and anti-Semitism would turn him into a 'handicapped slave to the Soviet regime'. At that time her husband tried to earn some extra money through giving private English

³⁹ International journalism was an entirely elite occupation in the Soviet Union, a pipe dream of many ordinary people because it was one of the few opportunities to officially travel around the world.

lessons to potential migrants to Israel and soon was suspected of Zionism, with the possibility of imprisonment. That is why they decided to emigrate to the USA in 1977, using her Jewishness as an advantage.

In 1977, 'a year before the prospective departure from the country', she and her husband decided to quit their jobs because they did not want their colleagues to have consequences related to their exodus. They knew that had they stayed on their jobs longer, she could have completed her thesis but their colleagues would have been involved in the intra-departmental investigation by the KGB and some people might have lost their jobs. That is why, thinking not about themselves but about the others (which was very typical of Soviet intellectuals), F(X) and her spouse simply resigned and started to live on private English lessons, in constant jeopardy of being accused of abstaining from legal work.

In 1978 they arrived in Chicago to join the Jewish diaspora. In Chicago she was working as a translator in a hospital with 'patients who were cot-cases and even terminal cases'. She started to hate Chicago for this job, for its high crime rates, for her son's alienation, and for losing her husband. He simply made use of her Jewishness and herself, having emigrated to the USA and having completed his US doctorate while she was working at the hospital. Finally he divorced her and their separation was very lengthy and painful. Thus she was left alone in an exhausting and far from intellectual job and with a pre-adolescent son as her responsibility.

Four years afterwards, in 1982, she came to another American city to re-unite with her Moscow friends who had arrived in the USA a little before her. She needed them badly because she was under a lot of strain. In her new place she was unemployed for the next nine months, 'receiving the government dough in line with drug addicts'. She even tried to become a network administrator but mostly 'lived in the gutter, somewhere in the slums'.

In January 1985 she got to Princeford⁴⁰ – 'absolutely by chance'. She responded to an urgent temporary job advertisement, which said that they needed a very short-term substitute teacher for the adult evening classes. That person could be 'whatever

⁴⁰ 'Princeford' (**Princeton** + **Stanford**) is a fictitious, collective name for one of the most prestigious Universities such as Princeton, Stanford, Harvard and Cornell, to which F(X) is now professionally affiliated.

but speaking Russian to a native standard'. Thus she started to teach Russian once a week 'on a miserly salary...at the extension school of continuing education for adults at Princeford'. Very soon her teaching talent was generously appreciated by her employer and in June 1985 she got the instructor position at Princeford, where she has been teaching four advanced courses, including lectures, on Russian Literature for twenty years.

The year 1985 was 'one of the luckiest years' for her in various directions. She did not only find a good job but also got married to her colleague, who was Russian by origin and her 'kindred spirit'. She has, however, evidently not forgotten her ex-spouse's betrayal or her first love affair. Nevertheless, her Princeford life has provided her with a feeling of relative comfort and self-esteem. In fact, she loves her new job and the working conditions at Princeford. Her heart still 'aches for the lost Russia'. Though confused about her national identity, F(X) generally seems to enjoy missing Russia, nevertheless; which is very typical of her former compatriots in exile.

Summary of F(X)'s career trajectory

F(X)'s career trajectory is that of an 'academic Cinderella', allowed into the 'academic Eden', who turned into a Jewish dissident 'after midnight'. She started her Soviet trajectory as a 'child of the Thaw' or as an 'emancipated person from the Soviet Renaissance' and ended up as a dissident. She herself sees her trans-national career as 'consisting of two independent and disconnected lines – Soviet and American' – for the following reasons. First, in emigration she switched to a totally new teaching domain – to an entirely new academic territory. Initially trained as a theoretician of English, she turned into a specialist in Russian Studies. These are two relatively adjacent yet clearly distinct academic domains. Second, her career is marked with a long-term non-academic gap of eight years (1977-1985) between leaving her Soviet academic job and resuming her academic status at Princeford. The overall vertical mobility of her trans-national career is static because she was Junior Instructor in the USSR and now she has the position of Princeford Instructor. If we consider her Soviet career separately, her Soviet vertical mobility may even be downward, as she was unemployed right before emigration. However, her horizontal

mobility is that of progression because she started to teach in one academic Eden, that of the MSU, and ended up in another, much more prestigious, academic paradise – that of Princeford. Her declaration ‘I have got to Princeford and that is why, I do not regret anything’ implies that this horizontal progression compensates for the vertical stasis in her social mobility. At the same time, she makes a contradictory confession that she would still have preferred to be Professor in Moscow rather than Instructor at Princeford if she had not been denied such a chance.

The story of F(D): Paradise lost and regained

F(D) was 48 at the moment of the interview. She was born in the city of Kazan, the Tatar Autonomous Republic within the Russian Federation. It was officially Russia and de facto not quite Russia. Kazan is akin to a quasi-academic centre, somewhere in-between Moscow and the Russian periphery. Famous for its academic tradition and the quality of knowledge, the Kazan State University (KSU) was the Alma Mater of Vladimir Lenin.

F(D)’s parents were both philologists, having graduated from the KSU from the Department of Tatar Literature. They worked as teachers for a long time before her father switched to journalism and her mother chose the route of speech pathologist. Yet they both stayed close to language studies. F(D) chose the KSU and the Department of Russian Literature under the influence of her parents.

Her interest in languages was contributed to by the nationalistic revival in which her parents decided to participate. At home they talked to F(D) only in Tatar. They wanted their daughter to master this minority language to the fullest. As for Russian, they knew she would unavoidably master it at nursery school. However, it was not as easy as it had seemed. She came to the nursery school at the age of four without any knowledge of Russian at all and the other children started to laugh at her. She says that her acquaintance with the Russian language started with ‘tears and identity crisis’. When they soon started to study English, ‘it made everyone equal’ and she rapidly progressed in it and outperformed all her peers, having proven that she was ‘not an idiot’. Through English she overcame her identity crisis and re-gained self-respect.

When graduating from high school she was wrestling between English and Russian as a future college major. She had 'very touchy emotions toward English' and 'no less special reminiscences of Russian'. At the same time, she was intoxicated by an opportunity to study in the Alma Mater of her parents. The KSU was a 'living legend' in their family, an inter-generational academic home. Unfortunately, English was not taught there. That is why she decided on Russian and applied to the Department of Russian Literature.

While at college, she truly enjoyed the intellectual life yet was seriously annoyed to the fullest by the communist propaganda. She started a very solid professional friendship with her undergraduate advisor, who later recommended her to the PG programme immediately after graduation from the university.

In the first year of her PG studies, F(D) got married to a man from another town, got pregnant and moved to her husband's place, where they started to live together with his parents. That was a very hard emotional burden. Surrounded by entirely alien people, she felt like 'she was likely to crack up'. However, constantly moving between Kazan and her new place, she managed to complete her Soviet PhD in time and to defend it successfully.

At the age of twenty-five she found a job as a Russian instructor in the town where her husband's family lived. After having been the top student in her cohort and after having socialised with eminent scholars in Kazan, she found it unbearable to move to a peripheral and anti-intellectual place. Feeling 'exiled' from her 'little paradise,' she still decided to sacrifice her career for the sake of her marriage.

In that 'peripheral' place she was teaching Russian as a Second Language to international students from developing socialist countries such as Afghanistan, Cambodia and Algeria. And here she came across not only anti-intellectualism but also the 'great Russian racism' revealed by the University administrators, who constantly refused to understand the students' needs. Having come 'under the patronage of the Big Brother⁴¹ of the whole socialist bloc', her students were immediately labelled as 'black dirty apes' by the locals and they kept asking her how this could be possible in the Soviet Union, officially known for its meritocracy and international solidarity. She could not answer their questions – just as she could not

⁴¹ The 'Big Brother' was a nickname for the Soviet Union.

answer her own question about why some of her Russian colleagues hated her so much. At work she used to hear 'behind-the-curtain whispers' such as, 'With her non-Russian ethnicity and with her non-Russian name, she mustn't be allowed to teach Russian at the University!' She came to understand that since that nursery school her whole life had been 'imbued with racism' and that the faster she advanced in her professionalism, the stronger the power of that racial hatred became. And her father's advice 'Try to be a true professional in your domain and you will be above any judgement', pronounced in her teenage years, did not work out in the current environment.

In bureaucratic terms, however, F(D)'s career was advancing quite well: from Junior Instructor to Associate Professor. By 1990 she had even started to work at her potential Doctor of Science degree (DrSc) [the second PhD] under the extra-mural supervision of her former PhD supervisor, with whom she had never lost connection.

Her marriage was gradually breaking up, however. The squabbles with her mother-in-law had tested F(D)'s patience to the limit. She wanted a divorce but had no place to go. She could not return to her parents' house because her younger brother had married and there was no vacant place there anymore. On the other hand, she could not afford to buy a flat of her own or even to rent a room on her academic salary.

While working on the literature review for her prospective DrSc, she applied for a research fellowship in the USA. That was one of the initiatives introduced by the perestroika. Because she had a very good and friendly relationship with the Rector, he wrote a very strong letter of reference for her. Having waited for the decision from Moscow for almost a year, she suddenly got a positive response. She was designated to go to the American Midwest for an academic year. Her family objected but she was firm. Finally her husband gave his consent because it struck him that she could save a considerable amount from her fellowship and then they would buy a flat of their own in Russia. And with that intent in mind, she arrived in the USA.

Welcomed by the American academic community, F(D) extended her stay every year, which was a serious problem for her husband. The money for a new flat had been saved and he set her the ultimatum: either America or him. As a result of that ultimatum, she divorced him yet lost the guardianship over her two adolescent

children. She spent the next five years in the American Midwest on grants and temporary jobs before she applied for a vacant position of Russian Instructor at Princeford and was accepted.

She is Instructor at Princeford now, married to an American Professor. Her children were finally reunited with her after having reached the age of eighteen. Her son is a sophomore, and her daughter is a nurse in the USA. What amazes her most of all in her own journey is that having planned a very short trip to America, with the purpose of just saving 'a little pocket money' and relaxing from the Soviet household routine; she ended up in actual emigration and an entirely new life, with which she is quite happy. And unlike F(X), she is not haunted by *nostalgia*, which she views as 'just a temporary psychological tension'.

Summary of F(D)'s career trajectory

F(D)'s vertical mobility in the USSR was upward: progressing from successful PhD completion to Senior Instructor and later to Associate Professor working toward professoriate. However, in emigration she shows downward vertical mobility because she started as a Research Fellow and her recent post is Instructor, which is two ranks lower than her last Soviet appointment. Her horizontal mobility in the USSR was regressive because having graduated from a prestigious Soviet academic Eden, she moved to a very peripheral college, much below her ambitions. Overall her horizontal mobility looks like a zigzag progression from her Soviet academic Eden to the US academic Eden of Princeford, where she regained her lost paradise. The regain of her Eden compensates fully for the vertical regression, supported by the fact that emigration solved her old family problems.

The story of F(Z): Jewish dream

F(Z) grew up in Moscow and was 41 at the moment of interview. She is Jewish. Her parents were historians, working in the archives of a very prestigious Soviet publisher. Having read a few popular sociological books, she started 'to dream about becoming a scholar of sociology'. However, the only route to this elite profession

was through the Department of Philosophy at the MSU, whose doors were carefully guarded against people with 'Jewish blood'.

On the one hand, her parents accentuated the importance of informal and lifelong education in her life through constant private tutors in foreign languages. As a result she had mastered three foreign languages, including English, German and French, as early as in high school. For an ambitious Soviet Jew that was the only path toward the accumulation of human capital. On the other hand, her parents could not explain to her where exactly she could apply this knowledge. They told her, 'Just learn and it may serve you well one day', for which she was constantly waiting 'with a mute patience of a dog'. At the same time, in a very 'slave-to-the-Soviet-regime' manner her father kept telling her that with her 'Jewish nose' (which was actually 'no longer than any other nose' and 'did not convey any particular signs of Jewry' or any other ethnicity), she 'must not even dream of the MSU' and she 'must be happy if she was accepted by a teacher training college'.

After graduation from the Faculty of History at one such college, the Moscow Pedagogical Institute, she worked as a schoolteacher of history. Simultaneously, she was a part-timer at INION (the Russian abbreviation for 'the Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences' at the SAS), translating and reviewing articles.

Those two years in a school, however, turned into an empty space, a non-placement, in her life. She was looking at herself 'as if from the distance', without even 'feeling alive'; it was 'neither pain, nor despair – just non-placement'. Having worked there for two years, she got married and went on a two-year maternity leave, after which she soon found a job at the International Department of the VSIOM (the Russian abbreviation for 'the State Institute of Studies in Public Opinion'), another institute of the SAS. Soon afterwards she transferred to the Department of Studies on Public Opinion and progressed as a sociologist.

Working at the VSIOM, she was engaged in extra-mural postgraduate studies in Moscow at the Institute of Sociology, SAS, where she later defended her 'Kandidatskaya' or the Soviet PhD thesis. After the defence she was immediately promoted to Senior Research Fellow. Working at the VSIOM, she divorced her husband, won a very prestigious foreign scholar Fellowship for one-year research in the UK and got married to an Englishman. After the Fellowship was over, she

worked in different places in the UK. Finally she got a lectureship position at a small college, where she has been recently promoted to Reader at the Department of Sociology.

Summary of F(Z)'s career trajectory

F(Z)'s story is that of Jewish dream and proclivity for independence. Her vertical mobility is upward at its every stage: in the USSR (from school teacher to Research Fellow) and in the UK (from Research Fellow to Senior Lecturer/Reader). Her horizontal mobility, however, may be considered as overall regression, as having worked for several years at an elite academic institution in Moscow, she finds herself recently in a low ranked UK college. In general, she is quite happy with her academic life as both perestroika and emigration brought to life her initially unrealistic, because Jewish, dream of becoming a scholar of sociology. She tries to look at her recent jobsite in the academic periphery as an opportunity to be relatively independent from administrative duties and constant grant applications, which would be obligatory at a University of a higher rank.

The story of M(X): Mathematician by default and academic gypsy

M(X) was forty-eight at the time of the interview. He is a Jew from Moscow, from an academic family. While at school he wanted to be a lawyer. However, the only way to study law in Moscow was through the Department of Law at the MSU, where access was obstructed for Jews in the Brezhnev era. Moreover, the area of Law was under constant pressure from the communist ideology. M(X) wanted something that would be 'ideologically clean'. That is why he said good-bye to this childhood project. Mathematics appeared 'completely free from ideology' and he was not bad at it while at school, participating in and even winning mathematical Olympiads. Therefore, at the age of seventeen he applied to the Department of Mechanics and Mathematics at the MSU, MechMat.

Despite his Jewish nationality, he was admitted at his first attempt because his father had connections. At college, he made friends with Academician A, an

academic Jew and a very famous scholar, who took M(X) under his patronage. Academician A became M(X)'s undergraduate advisor and mentor.

To his own surprise, M(X) was not affected by political anti-Semitism, gathering momentum in the Soviet Union. He was assigned to a very good place after graduation from the University - the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Straight from college he got the Intern position at Institute A, one of the SAS branches in Moscow, as recommended by Academician A. He even started to work extra-murally on his PhD thesis under the guidance of Academician A.

However, at Institute A M(X) very rapidly fell a victim of the anti-Semitic campaign. He was waiting for routine promotion from Intern to Junior Researcher at the end of the first year of his probation. But instead of being promoted, he was unfairly accused of having stolen institutional equipment. Because in mathematics there was 'nothing to steal other than a pencil and a roll of paper', which cost pennies; the nature of equipment was not specified in the accusations. The choice he had was either to resign or to be taken to court. He was 'clean' and not afraid of the litigation. However, it was so 'disgusting' that he decided to resign. That 'dirty political fraud' cost him 'a lot of nerves' and 'slowed down the process of writing PhD for a couple of years' because 'emotionally' he was 'feeling really bad'.

Yet luckily and not without Academician A's involvement, M(X) was hired by another SAS institution, Institute B, immediately after that fraudulent incident. At Institute B, M(X) obtained a Junior Researcher position. However, his dearest wish was to work with Academician A, who was placed at another institution within the SAS - the Landau Institute. That is why while at the Institute B, M(X) was patiently waiting for his chance to be transferred to Landau. He knew he would not stay at Institute B forever.

In less than a year, he was transferred to Landau - only to a rank lower (he came there as Intern) - which he did not regret because he knew that Landau was 'the best academic place in the world', with many opportunities for an academic career. In other words, he was in no way discouraged by that downward mobility.

After the defence of his Soviet PhD, written at Landau under the supervision of Academician A, M(X) rapidly progressed. He immediately became Junior Research

Fellow and then Research Fellow. Finally he was promoted to Senior Research Fellow. (He is still recorded as an unpaid employee there.)

During the perestroika, M(X) was 'fruit-picking', spending a semester in Moscow and another one abroad on grants. His '*dolce vita* seemed endless '. He attended a large number of conferences in all 'possible and impossible locations'. He liked to be an 'academic gypsy'. His first, undergraduate, marriage to his college sweetheart had collapsed just a little prior to the collapse of the Soviet Union and he was very happy with his freedom. He had freedom and 'the money donated by the perestroika'.

In this fashion M(X) 'had been working for a long time until all that started to break apart'. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, he got married for the second time in the early 1990s and spent two years at Princeton as a Senior Research Fellow. He had been invited to Princeton by Academician A, who had moved there a couple of years earlier. He really liked 'to live on the road' but he could not afford it anymore because he was a family man and 'the social convention in the face of his fair half demanded settlement and stability'. On the one hand he needed money to support his new family. On the other hand, he got used to living in the West, with its 'greenhouse conditions for academics'. That is why while at Princeton, M(X) started scanning a permanent position in the Western hemisphere and received two job offers – one from New Jersey and the other from the UK. He chose Great Britain because New Jersey 'did not entice him with its industrial neighbourhood '.

Thus he came to the UK as Lecturer in 1996. Soon afterwards, and almost immediately, he was promoted to Reader. Two years after his arrival in the UK, he became Professor, 'which is a rather fast growth'. At the time of the interview, M(X) was moving to Canada forever, in order to be closer to his old academic friends, the majority of whom are 'nestling on the American continent' – 'the SAS on the Hudson'.

Summary of M(X)'s career trajectory

M(X)'s vertical mobility is upward, in general: from Intern at the SAS to Professor in the UK. Moreover, he 'jumped' to the Professor position without having the Soviet Dr.Sc or the Western PhD (that is with the Soviet PhD only). His

horizontal mobility seems downward (although he does find himself upset about it). Having graduated from the academic Eden of the MSU, he had worked for almost twenty years at another academic paradise – the Landau Institute at the SAS. His emigration started with very prestigious fellowships at Princeton and Cambridge. Then he got a permanent position at a lower status University in the UK. In an effort to regain the lost Eden, he has recently moved to an established Canadian University, whose rank in mathematics is higher than that of his previous academic affiliation, as he admits. He says he is very happy with what he has because this is a tenure track, the dream of every academic emigre, and also because he never saw himself as ‘an inborn mathematician’ and ‘mathematics was never the love of his life’, as he confesses.

The story of M(E): ‘Organic intellectual’ – Buccaneer, scientist and poet

A man of fifty at the time of the interview, M(E) grew up in a small coastal town in the Crimea in a quasi-academic family. WW2 heroes, both his parents were granted privileged access to elite institutions in Moscow in the late 1940s to study engineering and were assigned after graduation to work as scientists in secret boxes, that is in military research institutions in the Crimea. His parents were absolutely devoid of any entrepreneurial qualifications and concentrated totally on intellectual work, constantly instigating his ambitions. Though his intellect is ‘just a little above the average’ (as he says), his ‘mother’s endeavours to tease’ his intelligence were more than a success. Thus under the influence of his mother (who kept telling him that he was ‘the best and the brightest’ and who saw the realisation of her unaccomplished dreams in him and his younger brother), he broke through to Moscow to ‘conquer a new terra’ because he ‘felt like a buccaneer’.

In high school he wanted to study some hard science, but was not sure what to give preferences to. He was extremely good at mathematics, having won the city Olympiad a couple of times. Yet he felt it was not precisely ‘what the doctor ordered’. He chose molecular biology because in those days it suddenly became a fashionable and promising direction and because he wanted to research in ‘something entirely new, extremely fashionable and promising’. In other words, what

he remembers about his teenage aspirations is that he was 'eager to get a degree from the most prestigious University in the country and to become a famous researcher in a cool, groovy area'. With that pursuit in mind, M(E) got to the MSU straight from school at the age of 17 in 1973, beginning his undergraduate studies at the Biological Faculty, the Biochemical Division.

As early as in his junior year, M(E) married his course fellow and very soon became the father of two children. However, his new family status in no way affected his professional growth. Though his wife was 'much more talented' than him, it was she who sacrificed her career for the sake of the marriage.

In other words, even after he had married, his career went on without substantial obstacles. In the same junior year, 1975, he initially chose his area of specialization at the Department of Biophysics. But at the same time Professor O, 'who was a super-grand VIP in the Soviet science and the vice president of the Academy of Sciences', founded the Department of Bioorganic Chemistry at the MSU. In the next semester M(E) was transferred to that department for his further specialization.

Right after college graduation in 1978, at the age of twenty-two, he was admitted to the daytime postgraduate programme at the same department under the supervision of his undergraduate advisor Professor O. Four years later M(E) defended his Kandidatskaya (the Soviet PhD) in molecular biology at the age of twenty-six and obtained the Junior Instructor position again at the same department in 1982.

Having worked there for three years, in 1985 he decided to switch from fundamental research to applied research. He was 'very keen on the domain of medical biology'. At the same time, he broke up with Professor O, who was a perfectionist and thought that M(E)'s side job was distracting him from his fundamental research. A 'chronic bachelor' himself, Professor O refused to understand that M(E) needed extra money to support his family. As a result M(E) was deeply hurt by that cruel attitude and left his job.

Fortunately, he had been offered the Senior Research Fellow position at a very prestigious laboratory where he could pursue his new research interests and lead a less stressful life. As he says, 'According to the Soviet standards, it was a very tempting job offer for a man in his late twenties'. In that laboratory M(E) was

working under the mentorship of another genius - Professor P, 'a remarkable scholar and a virtuoso anatomic pathologist of the Soviet times'. As M(E) remembers, Professor P personally opened up and examined the corpses of almost all Gensecs⁴² after Stalin". Professor P introduced M(E) to the 'academic crème de la crème' and forever impressed him as 'an awesome scholar and a terrific person', with whom our hero is still in touch.

The next four years were very prolific and fruitful with scientific discoveries. Under the guidance of Professor P, M(E) mastered the area of hypertonic disease genetics or 'the molecular genetics of the hypertonic disease'. Like a fairy godfather, in 1989 Professor P sent M(E) to a conference in Italy. From the connections initiated at that conference and also from the recommendation of Professor P, M(E) was offered the Senior Research Fellow position in 1990 at a very prestigious biomedical institution in Paris. He exclaims, 'Amazing how I got there!'

He spent two 'very stressful years' in that French laboratory. He explains the hardships of that time in terms of working extra loads for his French colleagues, with the 'laurels coming to those other guys'. Thus he was the inventor of a scientific idea about which he was writing an article in co-authorship with other scientists, whose input was much less significant. And he was initially promised first authorship in a very prestigious scientific journal. As a result, the article was published, yet with his name 'somewhere in the middle of the line' and his status was left less eminent than he expected. He was not psychologically prepared for this – for 'not being first'. That was his first professional disappointment.

Yet because he 'swallowed it', his French co-authors helped him right afterwards to get a position at another prestigious institution in the UK. Having come there 'as a PostDoc on a grant', he had worked there for eight years, 'jumping from one grant to another every other year', before he received a permanent position of Lecturer. While applying for this position, he had an opportunity to go to the Stanford University as a post-doctoral fellow. His final decision was in favour of the UK tenure track.

⁴² 'Gensec' (Russian) means 'The General Secretary of the Communist Party', the leader of the Soviet government.

His Russian colleagues call him ‘a true intellectual’ because, as he says, in exile he came to understand ‘the beauty of the world and the relativity of truth’. He writes poems and likes talking about the nature of true science, which is ‘relativity and uncertainty’. Thus he says:

I sometimes feel that I have gone too far in my quest, that there are so many things around and that I do not know anything at all. At such moments I feel puzzled. Yet what I like about this feeling of uncertainty is the presence of some abstract beauty and some abstract truth around you. In this intellectual quest, he has even developed his own theory of what it means to be a ‘true academic’. In his opinion, a true academic must have a subtle scientific taste – that is, to be very deliberate in his research topics – and have the killer instinct – that is, to achieve one’s ends by any means and regardless of circumstances.

Summary of M(E)’s career trajectory

M(E)’s vertical mobility is upward at the Soviet and post-Soviet stages, but not continuous. Having made a journey from PG student to Assistant Professor in Moscow, he started in emigration from a much lower position, that of PostDoc, and finally reached the same level as he had in Moscow – Lectureship. What specifically upsets him is a less speedy vertical progression in the West compared with that in the USSR. He says, M(E)’s horizontal mobility is static: all his workplaces are of the high, yet equal, status: the MSU, France and the UK. The dissatisfaction with his horizontal mobility is explained by his feeling of loss, related to a couple of missed job opportunities: the ‘grand career chance stolen’ by his French co-authors and the denied fellowship at Stanford. Because the latter perspective was his own choice and because the status of Stanford is higher than those of his actual jobs, he has a feeling of regret about ‘having passed by’ the main academic Eden in his life.

The story of M(S): Doctor and anti-sovetchik⁴³

M(S) was 63 at the moment of the interview. He came from a provincial academic family. He was born in a ‘tiny hamlet not far from Vladimir’, a typical

⁴³ ‘*Anti-sovetchik*’ means ‘anti-Soviet’ in Russian – ‘not a slave to the communist ideology’.

Russian town. Later his family moved to the hamlet *Molochnoye*,⁴⁴ which was near Vologda, a very provincial Russian place. His parents were instructors at the Vologda Institute of Dairy Products. His father taught Applied Warming Technologies and his mother taught Dairy Production Technology. Molochnoye was a 'tiny-teeny hamlet, not even found in the state map'. Yet there was a large, countrywide, dairy plant and the Vologda Institute of Dairy Products in that 'far-remote place'. As he mentions, 'If we ignore the plant and the institute, Molochnoye was a god forsaken village whose population was represented by ever drinking working class guys and a few students'. Having graduated from 'a typically Soviet rural school', he did not see 'any other alternative' than escaping to Moscow.

He wanted to study mathematics, his favourite subject at school, and nothing else - yet not necessarily in Moscow. However, after having looked through various manuals for applicants, he decided that Moscow 'might be the best place to study maths'. At the time of application he did not think about his future employment. It did not occur to him 'to bother' about where he would work and what he would do with mathematics. He 'just wanted to study mathematics at a good, prestigious, University'.

His parents generally objected to his decision about Moscow because they were afraid of losing him. And they tried to talk him into applying to the Institution where they were working. However, it led to no results, as he still went to Moscow, emerged through a 'very intense entrance competition of eleven persons per an entry spot' and matriculated at the MechMat-MSU.

While at college, he was a 'capable', yet 'go-lightly', student. That is why, he is now very thankful to a very good system of Soviet higher education, with its 'very severe academic requirements'. He believes he was lucky to have come across a very talented teacher Mr.β (who is recalled in several stories of my informants as having impacted upon their lives), who was 'spiteful' and 'crude' yet 'very fair'. Steered by Mr.β's rigid criticism, M(S) immediately turned into a very studious person.

Like M(E), M(S) got married very early – as a senior student – and also to his course fellow and college sweetheart. And as with M(E), M(S)'s trajectory was not

⁴⁴ '*Molochnoye*' (Russian) means "made of milk" ("a dairy product").

affected by his non-mature marital life, as the burden of the household chores, together with the career damage, was placed on his wife's shoulders.

Mr.β, mentioned above, became M(S)'s undergraduate advisor and lifelong mentor. Mr.β was Jewish and his family had been repressed by Stalin. Therefore, he deliberately helped Jewish students first of all. However, he made a rare exception for M(S) having appreciated the latter's brains. Mr.β did 'everything possible and impossible' to support his new disciple because he anticipated very fast scientific returns from this investment. Thus he arranged daytime post-graduate (PG) studies (*Kandidatskaya* or first doctoral thesis)⁴⁵ for M(S) and a good academic position for his wife, in order to let the couple be together in Moscow. In fact, it was not easy because both M(S) and his wife were from the provinces and the attitude of the University administration to accommodating such people, who were metaphorically known as '*limita*' or '*limitchiks*' (the thieves of Moscow comfort) was not always very cordial. In addition, the young family was in need of a living place. And Mr.β took care of that too. As M(S) recalls, 'Mr.β had a confidential talk with the principal. The latter made a confidential call to his close friend, who was a famous academician, and my wife got an internship at the SAS'.

Upon completion of the postgraduate school, with the simultaneous thesis defence, M(S) was to start working in the Academic City in Novosibirsk, the Siberian Branch of the SAS; where 'excellent living conditions and a two-bedroom flat were waiting for' him. But suddenly the MechMat was expanding and, therefore urgently demanding new academic staff. As a result and not without Mr.β's involvement, M(S) 'was kept in Moscow'; where he found himself 'poor yet intellectually enriched'.

For the next four years, M(S) was working at the Calculus Department at the MechMat-MSU. Then he was promoted to Associate Professor, yet to a department with a much lower rank. He started lecturing at the evening classes at the Department

⁴⁵ *Kandidatskaya* (Russian) - equivalent to Western PhD - was the first doctoral degree in the Soviet Union. The most common and convenient route toward this degree was the daytime, or fulltime, post-graduate programme. This degree is still prevalent in Russia. So is the second doctoral degree – that of Doctor of Science, or DrSc.

of Psychology, where ‘no one really cared about mathematics and all students were constantly cheating’.

Accommodation was ‘a horrible hardship’. Because M(S) and his wife were from the Russian periphery (‘intellectual *limitchiks*’), they had no flat of their own and, therefore, lived in the residence hall. They had lived in such conditions ‘for a good ten years’. They had a room there, sharing the shower and the kitchen with the whole floor. While living in such conditions, he managed to write and defend the DrSc thesis at the age of thirty-two after having worked on his algebraic equation for seven years.

Then they were offered a room in a two-bedroom flat, where there was another family. It was a flat consisting of only two rooms: one for M(S) and his family and the other – for another family. The kitchen and the bathroom were shared facilities. As he remembers, his flat mate was ‘a horrible piece of mud’. She kept spying on him and his wife, peeping and telling lies. All in all they had lived like this for five years until the building was ruined and they were allocated a two-bedroom flat of their own.

He confesses that the housing conditions and his transfer to the anti-intellectual department were likely to cause depression in him. At those ‘painful ‘ moments, he delved into fundamental research and teaching. He says, ‘The harder it was, the more ardently I worked on an equation’. He cannot determine for sure what contributed more to his DrSc thesis – his professional perseverance or the hardships of Soviet life, as instigating that perseverance. He even thinks that had he been living in a ‘greenhouse’ for all those fifteen years, he might not have become as prolific as he is. Since the time of his Soviet PhD completion, he had been non-stop researching in mathematics and teaching it to both undergraduate and PG students, also supervising PhD (Kandidatskaya) theses of the latter.

No sooner did the hard times seem over, than the chaos of the perestroika started to ‘invade’ their lives. He got hooked on the easy money and went to teach mathematics in Madagascar for three years. He had hardly returned, when everything began to collapse, forecasting the Soviet collapse. There were no sufficient salaries, no goods, no groceries, and no normal professional relations.

For all those years, 'the communist spirit had been still high'. And M(S) was being constantly advised to become a member of the communist party, in order to facilitate his own career. In fact, he had been Associate Professor for almost twenty years, holding the DrSc degree all that time. However, he firmly declared that he did not 'want any affiliation with that quagmire', by which he meant the party. Luckily, that statement had led to no consequences because people still de facto respected his intellectual capacity. Yet he wanted a little more than just 'an intangible reputation of a good scholar'. And he set the ultimatum to the MSU Principal: either he gets Professorship or he moves to another University. The perestroika had opened many commercial doors to him. The outcome of that ultimatum is still unknown because very soon M(S) received an invitation for a Professor position from a very prestigious American University and accepted it, thinking, 'If my country does not need me, I will find another country for myself'.

It was the year 1990, when the USSR was still alive. And the official route of emigration might not run smooth because 'the KGB could not simply allow' M(S)'s family to leave the country forever. 'People, especially all those administrators, were very mean and behaved like vampires: they could not relax until they spoiled somebody's life', as he recalls that neurotic time shift. That is why, his American colleagues advised him to organise a family journey with a short visit to the US and then to apply for asylum. Since then he and his family have been residing in America.

Summary of career trajectory of M(S)

M(S)'s trajectory is marked with vertical upward mobility and a horizontal zigzag progression. Vertically he was moving upwards – very rapidly at the very beginning of his career, until he defended his DrSc at the age of thirty-two – yet very slowly after the DrSc defence. The change of pace can be explained by his intentional alienation from ideology – the fact evidently having aggravated the later speed of his Soviet progression.

In horizontal terms, he had a regression in the USSR. Having graduated from the academic Eden of the MSU, he was working at a place quite marginal in mathematics. His career in emigration is that of horizontal progression because he

was invited to a permanent Professor position at a very prestigious US University, with a world famous department of mathematics.

What is striking in his career development is that having defended the DrSc relatively early, he got recognition much later and only in exile.

Motivation for academic career

In an effort to answer the question of why my informants have decided to become academics, I refer to their childhood and adolescent reminiscences.

Falling in love

Absolutely for all of them, their motivation started from the 'love' of their subject that started as early as in their adolescence and even childhood. For some of them, including F(X), M(Y) and M(Q) it was unconscious, irrational, almost Freudian, and uncontrollable.

F(X): It was a sort of mystery, when people believe in a God-given gift and feel the God's sign. It was the same with me. Starting from the second lesson of English at school, I got a perception of something absolutely miraculous. I found it amazing to be able to name the same objects in different ways. The existence of a totally different language, with totally different words, was instantaneously accepted by me on the level of intuition. That fact stimulated my interest and the desire to express one and the same thought in different languages. Then I fell head over ears in love with English sounds and the melody of British speech. It was really very strong! Now it is a shame to remember what happened to me when I once came to Moscow. I was a school kid of sixteen when I heard Englishmen speaking English in the street. I lost my head! I was hypnotised! I simply started to follow them. I was with my sister, who began to panic and kept saying, 'What a shame! We mustn't be seen with foreigners!' But for me it was *music*! Believe it or not, but for me it was the love at a glance or at a sound!

M(Q): In the 2nd grade of the elementary school...I was keen on becoming a biologist....I was obsessed with various animals and imaginary trips to Africa. My buddy and I used to draw our imaginary routes on the map, dreaming of where we

would go. Biology was teasing me with an entirely new and enigmatic world.

For others, represented by M(X) and F(Y); it was a combination of reason and emotion – a very calm and reasonable love affair. Some informants showed quite a rational approach toward planning their future – the attitude that still reflected their *irrational* desire to be emancipated from ideology. It becomes evident that through the emancipated professional identity, the informants, as young people, sought to compensate for their artificial and unhealthy civic identities:

M(X): I was born in 1956. The Soviet Union has influenced my careers and my classmates' careers very much. I might have not chosen the career of a mathematician. I was capable in mathematics but I was also good at other things. Like many of my friends, I chose maths because it was the most distant from the ideology area and because it did not require any equipment except a sheet of paper and a pen. It promised *complete* freedom. The complete alienation from the Soviet system was the main reason for such a choice. I think if there had been no Soviet system, many people would have chosen something different from mathematics, when living in the Western conditions...I could have become a lawyer or a doctor. But in those days mathematics was one of the few areas, if not the only one, that were "clean" from ideology, *not mucky*.

F(Y): In the Soviet times it was one of scarce places where you could fully realise your potential without delving into politics. People could do science there without touching politics or having squabbles. As a beautiful science, maths attracted many young people. There were also some remains of academic culture there. You could pursue at least some sort of career and earn something, though not much. For that career there was no pre-requisite of the Communist Party membership, unlike in other areas. If you did not aim to become a department head, you did not have to become a communist. In other words, MechMat was a relatively "clean" place and maths was a relatively "pure" academic domain, though everything in this life is relative, of course...To be honest, I also wanted to study history. My father asked me to his office and said, "Do you understand that you will have *to tell lies* all the time? Every single step of yours will spin a lie. Do you understand *what* you will have to write in every single paper of yours whatever you do? Do you understand how challenging it will be for you to pass all the exams? Think about it!" I thought it over and agreed with him.

F(E) fell in love with physics first and then, after having weighed all pros and cons, confirmed her fundamental commitment to it:

My brother is a physicist. He is twelve years my senior. As a child, I often went backpacking with him and his friends. My attitude to physics as a science was shaped by my impression of its people – the physicists with whom I was socializing there. My motivation for studying physics emerged as a result of my communication with the brother's friends. I was sure that choosing your occupation you also choose people among whom you will live. I met very curious people during those camping holidays. They were obsessed with their domain. At the same time, they had versatile interests such as literature, history and poetry. They gave me the impression of a very rich spiritual life. It was evident that those guys were always searching for something inside themselves. All this was still happening in the Soviet Union. Until the very moment of school graduation, I was uncertain about to which faculty to apply, choosing between physics and foreign languages. Physics overweighed eventually because it seemed more tempting for me in terms of skill application and professional communication. It seemed to promise many more chances of further self-realization.

As I have already mentioned, their fascination with a specific subject started to develop since their early years – and under the influence of various factors affecting their lives as early as in childhood. Those factors embrace: (a) the role of a schoolteacher; (b) books and family education; (c) a particular childhood episode; and (d) the impact of significant others, including those related to childhood and pre-adolescent infatuations.

For example, M(X) recalls the images of his schoolteachers as impacting upon his relationship with mathematics:

Why did I decide to become a mathematician? I was influenced by the *charisma* of our maths teacher. I was lucky to have an amazing maths teacher. He was a very old man. Very accurate in scientific knowledge, he was enamoured with his subject. His infatuation with the knowledge quest was always acknowledged by and transferred to us. It was only him who instigated my interest in maths and my ardent desire to master it... I became keen on hard sciences only as a 9th grader, which was rather late for vocational choice making I think. I must confess that at that age I was more fascinated by physics. Still in love with it, I have been trying to apply maths to theoretical physics. I was at the brink of applying to study physics when a maths student from the University started to intern in our school. He organised a maths club for us and delivered several lectures on various topics.

Especially astonished by the information about odd numbers [speaks with passion; seems very excited], I made up my mind to study maths right after that lecture, which was the final decision.

M(G)'s decision to study mathematics at a particular University was influenced by his club tutor, whose example M(G) wanted to follow:

I was sixteen when I joined the mathematical club for high school students at the MSU. I succeeded there a lot and impressed my tutor. Monitored by the most talented mathematical students of the MSU, those evening classes were a valid substitute for what is now known as mathematical school or school with concentration in mathematics. I had a fantastic tutor, a guy who was just a couple of years older than myself. He is in California now. He greatly influenced my career choice. Fascinated by his manner of teaching, I made up my mind to enter the MechMat.

As mentioned above, F(X) and F(D) correspondingly refer to their childhood experiences of listening to the native English speech and of backpacking with the brother's colleagues in terms of affecting the informants' infatuation with English and Physics.

For some people, such as F(Z) and M(E) books and family tradition became a strong steering force in choosing a subject:

F(Z): At the age of fifteen I was dreaming of becoming a sociologist. I was madly attracted by ideas from translated books by American sociologists.

M(E): My Mum...She was very capable. Her undergraduate qualifying paper was evaluated by academician Kapitza [he speaks with adoration and pride]. He invited her to his house, where he endorsed the reference letter...My Mum always facilitated my keen interest and that of brother in natural sciences and stimulated our healthy ambitions...She kept telling us that we needed to learn more; that she herself had been a top student in her class despite the hard times; and always referred to her father, who had been a devoted schoolteacher of maths. Both my brother and I tried hard to confirm our Mum's expectations. We both were the winners of the city Olympiads on chemistry and physics. As you see, hard sciences were our family tradition.

The informants acknowledge the involvement of their significant others in their disciplinary preferences. Here we come to understand how chance and intimate

relations may influence professional decisions. The informants themselves acknowledge the importance of chance in their professional choices.

Thus, for M(Q) and M(G) their love affair with molecular biology and mathematics started correspondingly from their boyish crushes with a girl-next-door and with a young music teacher:

M(Q): Even in the 2nd grade of the elementary school I joined a club of Young Naturalists and decided that I would become a biologist. I had a friend. She was the girl I had a crush with, my elementary school sweetheart. I actually joined that club because she had joined it before. I followed her because I wanted to be closer to her all the time. Then she was sent to a famous Moscow maths school and I followed her again. Thus we were at school together. But soon afterwards we ceased to socialise, I don't know why. But I was still keen on becoming a biologist.

M(G): When I was a 10th grader (in the pre-final year of studies), my teacher of music, a very beautiful young lady in her early twenties, introduced me to a famous maths professor, who was her distant relative and who lived in a luxurious cottage in the Arbat, one of the central Moscow streets. He was a famous Soviet Jewish mathematician. This is how I got to know him. I kept paying him regular visits during those tea parties in his house. For me it was an opportunity to see her more regularly and in a less formal atmosphere and also to impress her. First he was keen on talking with me on various general topics about music and culture. He was a great fan of Russian classical music and literature. Having quite a diverse range of personal interests, he enjoyed lending to me books and then discussing them with me. Once during those literary debates it occurred to him to challenge me with a mathematical task. He loved triggering people intellectual capacities. For him it was a means of scanning young talent. After I had coped with the equation he flattered me with a compliment, 'Sir, you are an inborn mathematician!' I was profoundly shocked with such assessment because I had never thought of becoming a mathematician. This is how I got hooked on maths.

My father was General of Engineering Troops whereas my mother was a medical scholar, a holder of a PhD in medical sciences. She spent all day at work. So did my father: he was mostly involved in managing military research in Kazakhstan, where they used to have a military base. Growing up, I was left on my own and the music teacher was a God-given gift for

me. The main participant in my education, she impacted greatly on my career choice.

M(G)'s case is marked with a chain of inter-related factors. A home-alone child, he easily became fond of his young music teacher, who was his 'only companion and kindred spirit'. Initially his choice of an academic discipline was formed under the influence of his teenage crush, who introduced him into a 'Jewish bourgeois salon', the Moscow intellectual elite; where he made useful connections and, as a result of a small episode, was diagnosed as a future mathematician.

The same, 'home-alone-child' phenomenon is mentioned by another participant M(O), whose pre-adolescent solitude brought him into a computer club, which later became the starting point of his interest in applied mathematics:

My parents used to spend all day at work and I was on my own. They kept bringing me to various clubs. But I was keen on nothing...Regarding my self-realization, I was a stay-at-home, whose public life was very restricted. I was not a "public" person...In the end, my parents managed to bring me to the Pioneer Palace, where there was a Club Fair. I was nine then and I got interested in the computer-programming club. I really liked it. It was so different from my school environment, where all children were from the working class background...After I had joined the computer club, my working day ran on the following scheme: school, a fast dinner at home and then the club from 2 to 7 p.m. Imagine huge space, computer games, many new friends and the ocean of freedom. The club advisors soon appreciated my diligence and provided me with the door key and all the entrance codes. Therefore I simply "lived" there. I felt like the little king of the world. In my mind's eye I was the master of that magic room. Behind the doors there were crowds of children hackers. They did not have access to computers because the latter were a rarity in Moscow. As for me, I had a lot of power over them. Children love power. It actually spoils them. For those guys behind the doors I was akin to the god, which lasted for several years.

As we can see, there is an element of rational choice in his decision to master computer science and later applied mathematics: he was attracted by the power of knowledge – the force that gave him a tangible advantage over other children.

As is evident from the reaction of the informants' parents (with the exception of those who were academics themselves), the academic profession was not highly popular in the USSR other than in academic circles.

In the academic families, the parents supported their children's pursuit toward an intellectual career:

F(W): The academic profession is a long-term tradition in our family. We had several generations of academics. For example, my Mum was Professor of Geography whereas my Grandfather was Professor of Biology. I always dreamt about an academic career, the career of a scholar.

F(B): My interest in physics was logically predetermined: both my Dad and elder brother are physicists. As a child, I spent more time with my brother and dad than with my mother and sister. During our frequent bike trips to the forest, my Dad loved telling me various physics related stories. First my Dad was a scientist. Later he started to teach physics at the Minsk State University, at the Faculty of Chemistry.

F(Y): My father was a mathematician, a famous professor of mathematics at the Moscow State University. He published several books. From his stories, I even know the "ancient" history of the MechMat.

M(Y): My father was interested in the mechanics of explosion, working for the famous Lavrent'ev in Moscow. The latter was engaged in the bomb design project. After having come to Kiev, my father became especially keen on how to create artificial diamonds, for example, carbon, that would cut any steel by mean of explosion. My mom was a scientist of geology, focusing on the age of paleontology. She had spent a lot of time on geological expeditions before she had started an academic career in Kiev, teaching geography and geology at the Polytechnic Institute.

The supportive tendency can be observed in the semi-academic families of M(G) and M(O): M(G)'s mother was a medical scholar, whereas M(O)'s father was a nuclear physicist.

The majority of non-academic parents wanted their children to be engineers or doctors:

M(Q): My parents, both engineers, were in confrontation with my decision to study biology. I am from an engineering background. My grandfather kept talking me into changing my mind. He kept saying that biology was not a serious science. He wanted me to become an engineer because, according to

the Soviet standards, it was a gainful occupation – or a doctor, at least.

F(X): My parents were ordinary Soviet engineers. They strongly objected. They thought Philology was not a reliable profession and wanted me to become a doctor or an engineer.

And here my informants had to defend their ‘love’ and to resist the parental pressure. That resistance culminated in victory for the informants:

F(X): Having graduated from high school in 1960, I firmly declared to my parents that I was going to apply only to a faculty of foreign languages. I firmly declared that I would study *only there* or *NOWHERE*. And they gave up. What could they do!

The following observation can also be made from the study of their college choices, reflected in the interviews above. In general terms, they were very serious about making this irreversible decision as that of a lifetime. They knew that in the Soviet Union there was almost no possibility for changing occupation. At the age of seventeen, they knew that they were choosing their lifetime occupation.

Vocational maturity

However, at the age of seventeen, the majority of them did not yet imagine what it meant to be an academic.⁴⁶ They just wanted to master their favourite school subject at a very prestigious and even the best University of the country:

M(S): I don’t know if I ever thought about things like that when applying to the MSU. In those years it wouldn’t even occur to me to bother about things like that [he seems very puzzled]. No, I think I never thought about it then. I could not even imagine what precisely I would do as a mathematician. I just wanted to study mathematics at a good, prestigious, University.

It was the combination of love (of the subject) and ambitions – the ‘buccaneer’ phenomenon, sometimes running as a family tradition – often facilitated by such

⁴⁶ For information on vocational stages, see Super et al. (1965) and Chart 7.

factors as provincial life (associated with quagmire and the absence of any mobility) and the example of parents (who once were intellectual buccaneers themselves):

M(E): My Mum and Dad *did not specifically coach* me in any particular discipline. But they kept stirring my penchant to go to Moscow to study their. That was not surprising because my Dad was a graduate from the Moscow Military Academy, named after marshal Zhukovsky, and my Mum was a graduate of the Moscow Chemical Institute, named after Mendelev. Living in the periphery, we were very keen on breaking through to Moscow, on buccaneering that big city, on gaining first-class education and on achieving something.

Was there anyone who knew precisely at the age of 15-17 that he or she would be a scholar? Such people, including the earlier mentioned F(W) and F(Y), were usually from elite academic families ('academic stables'). In the rest of the cases, this understanding came no earlier than the age of 19. Thus having failed several application options, F(X) was twenty when she purposefully applied to the RomGer-MSU, in which she 'had found herself more keenly interested' by that time because 'they offered a wider philological education' and 'precisely matched' her 'intellectual portfolio'.

In the majority of my cases, a conscious interest in the academic profession (and particularly, in fundamental research in hard sciences, which was separated from teaching in the USSR) started to develop when a person was to choose his specialty or concentration area in his or her junior year - that is, at the age of 19. And that choice was pre-determined by a variety of circumstances, such as (a) a more specific love of a new problem area (as a consequence of a particular course attendance); (b) a miniature scientific revolution, which might sometimes lead to (c) the foundation of a new department, (d) new academic connections that promised a bright professional future; (e) a specific episode, instigating a more specific interest; or (f) all of these together. And considering the stage of academic career development, here it makes sense to mention the foundation of relatively stable specific interests. The case of M(H) illustrates the effectiveness of these factors:

After the second year of studies (it was 1966) we went to the Tzelina, the prairie in Kazakhstan. As college students, we were *required* by the communist party to do 'voluntary' farming work in the Soviet

Union. Through informal conversations with other students there I got information about a new department opening very soon at our faculty. That was the Department of Wave Processes, which was to deal with non-linear optics and laser physics. I was reading enormously about laser applications and was very interested in them. That is why I decided to keep in mind the news about the new department. I knew I would need it in the close future...When the 3rd year of my studies started, we were given lectures by the academician Prokhorov, who had just been awarded the Nobel Prize for the laser discovery. After the lecture course was over, he suggested that the students should pass the non-grade exam (for *pass* or *fail*) in the FIAN, the Institute of Physics at the Academy of Sciences, where he worked full-time. I was very keen on going there...I was the only student among those who had chosen to pass the exam on that day. We had been given several days for passing that exam [He recalls those events with a feeling of bliss]. Academician Prokhorov asked me to have a seat. This is how we met. Then he said, 'Well, go ahead and tell me what you have learnt'. And we had a really great conversation about the content of the course, after which he told me, 'Give me your grade book [the personal student grade register]'. I answered, 'No, I can't because I am only a sophomore. It is too early for me to pass the exam officially. I have been attending your course only to get to know you and to grasp your ideas'...My keen interest and my gusto were generously rewarded by Academician Prokhorov, who let me to his kingdom of laser physics. It was an absolutely amazing tour of all his labs in the FIAN, where he was a god. He introduced me to very many scholars there and showed me the latest and the most outstanding achievements in laser technology and laser physics.

In the course of their career progression, my informants' proclivity for fundamental research supplanted their interest in teaching, in many cases. However, M(S) admits that he started to love teaching at moments of despair, as a way to compensate for his 'unhealthy civic identity'. When he was stifled by the housing conditions, constant scandals with his flat mates, and with communist imbecility, he found a deep relief in teaching mathematics even to 'dummies from the Psychology Department'. He felt alive when socializing with those 'Moscow teenagers not spoilt by the dirty Soviet routine'. He recalls even his most unable students with much warmth:

I remember two female students from the Psychology Department who kept *cheating* on mathematical tests and they did it very professionally. I could not help admiring their virtuoso cheating skill. It was a contest between two professionals: I was a perfectionist in mathematics whereas they reached the level of perfection in cheating.

I was awfully curious and intrigued whether I could catch them red-handed or not. Once I invented a trick: I asked them to sit at the desks in which the drawers had been turned to the opposite direction so they could not put anything into the drawers. Yet they did manage to complete the test excellently. And I failed to see them using any textbook or prompter. I don't know how they managed to cope with the situation. Still their tests were impeccable. I had been puzzling over that case for long enough before it finally struck me, 'Who knows maybe they did not cheat at all? What if it was me again who had taught them?' It made me feel proud of myself.

M(E) acknowledges that he has eventually inherited his mentor Mr.β's viewpoint about teaching as 'an invigorating force'. And here we can see how the spontaneous, almost adolescent, love of fundamental research gradually changes into a very mature feeling about teaching:

M(G): As a young man, I was scared by the thought that I might spend all day at my desk writing papers. That scenario appeared very boring for me when I was a college student. As a result, I figured out that it was extremely interesting [He laughs happily]. When you are working on an interesting problem, it is never boring. Preparing for lectures is also exciting if you put too much of yourself into the process. Most of all I like working with my post-graduate students [speaks in a very contented voice].

F(Y): I liked teaching in technical institutions very much. I was a very good teacher [speaks very proudly]. Secondly, teaching maths greatly developed my logical thinking, which is very useful in everyday life, with the latter so stressful. At the moments of hardship or despair, I went to teach and noticed how my logic and, consequently, life attitude changed.

F(X): My dearest wish is *never to stop teaching*. I am 63 now and I often think that if I were allowed to work for another ten years, I would be as happy as a clam because this is all I need to be happy! Teaching college students is now in my blood!

F(X) particularly acknowledges the impact of emigration upon the development of her love for teaching:

Princeford students are incredibly spoiled and demanding. That is why as a teacher, I have developed very many qualities in myself, for example, *creativity*. In a classroom I have learnt to be creative and to utilise every skill and every bit of knowledge I possess. While

teaching my Princeford kids, I feel like an actress on the stage. It is a fantastic feeling of bliss.

This infatuation with their own profession allowed some of my informants to never regret having chosen the academic path. 'Never in my life have I regretted about my occupational choice', says F(X). 'I just cannot imagine myself doing anything other than physics', adds M(H). An exceptional case is M(X), who confesses, 'I firmly believe that mathematics is only for people who cannot do anything else...I could have done other things. But I became a mathematician because I was growing up in the Soviet Union. Under different circumstances my life would have take quite a different turn. I am not sure that it was the right choice'.

Others, such as F(D) and M(E), came across the mid-career crisis, thinking about a possible career change:⁴⁷

F(D): Yes, I must admit that while in Iowa I did think about switching to medicine, as my father had wanted me to. I think I was just very tired and lonely.

M(E): The moments of despair, when you want to quit everything and try a totally new field...But very soon you ask yourself what you are going to do with this new field. The thing is that by the age of 40 you have become such a narrow specialist that you find yourself not qualified to do anything else. Of course, you could scream, 'Enough! I am quitting everything!' And what next? Still you go on doing what you have been doing all the time. Why drive yourself mad then?

In some cases, the crisis was facilitated by a person's placement in the "wrong domain". The wrong domain affiliation could arise due to the lack of mobility – the situation when the person found himself 'bogged down in the quagmire', involved in research he was not committed to anymore:

M(G): I realised that my mind got stuck in pure mathematics and that I found it hard to set my brains on solving an equation. In pure mathematics one should set his mind toward the task for half a year or a year and only then one can expect the desired result. It is a lengthy process. I realised that I needed a new domain – the applied mathematics. I was becoming keener and keener on this kind of work. Because of the inter-departmental bureaucratic barriers that

⁴⁷ For information on mid-career crisis, see Super et al. (1965).

impeded my access to the new field and to the information about it, I got stuck and started to feel very careless about it.

Unlike M(G), M(E)'s depression was caused by his entrance to a new field, in which he had neither experience nor interest, and by being put under the pressure of producing fast results at the price of quality – a way he had not been used to working before:

I accomplished research on a very hot topic. It was *my* domain. Then I was suddenly commanded to commit another, totally different and almost insurmountable, task. The results were very uncontrollable. It was not clear whether I was on the right route or on a crooked path. There was no precision in my findings. I started to feel like a *Lysenko*, an academic fraud. That caused depression.

Resonant with these two cases, M(X) believes that being on your own research territory is vitally important for a scholar:

What if you have not yet found your direction, your 'equation'? What if you have been doing something that is not yours for your whole life? Don't forget that any science, such as mathematics, in my case, consists of very many different things. It is very important for a scholar to find this specific interest. You should always be in search and you should work really hard. Of course, you may not find what you have been looking for. But if you are dormant, you will definitely get nothing.

The crisis situation, with its moments of doubt, was sometimes caused by economic instability in the country and a person's fear of losing his financial security. Even F(X), who has never regretted her professional choice, underwent an eight-year period of abstinence from academic work, during which she made efforts to switch to other occupations. However, her case cannot be considered as one of mid-career crisis because it was enforced abstinence from academia – due to the assimilation in emigration. And those problems were related to the adjustment in a new cultural environment only rather than to any professional doubts. In the opinion of M(E), a mid-career crisis is not a serious challenge for a true scholar:

Interviewer: In the midst of their careers, academics sometimes have to choose between doing science and money making. How painful is such a choice for scholar?

M(E): There is nothing tragic about this choice. If a scholar does what he doesn't feel like doing, he is not a scholar anymore. That is why the issue of tragedy is automatically cancelled. If someone is a true scholar, he will go on doing what he feels like doing, regardless of anything.

To track the informants' motivation across twenty or thirty years of their academic work reflects the evolution of their intelligence – the way their capacity to utilise the direction their intellect was shaping:

M(X): On the early stages I started to feel the mathematical beauty. If I managed to solve many equations, inevitably mastered a beautiful approach or a beautiful mathematical idea. It began to trigger me. Besides, I had a competitive character. Participating in Olympiads for teenagers, I was championship driven. Those Olympiads contained both sport and aesthetics. When I was a teenager, my sport interest in maths was prevailing. Then I was becoming more and more attracted by the mathematical beauty.

M(E): I must say that with age I was becoming more and more disillusioned. With age you start to understand how the world is constructed, what is really interesting for you and what does not deserve your attention. First you think that you can do *everything*. Then you think that you *deliberately know* what to do. I would say that one great illusion is substituted by another. I sometimes feel that I have gone too far in my quest, that there are so many things around and that I do not know anything at all. At such moments I feel puzzled. Yet what I like about this feeling of uncertainty is the presence of some abstract beauty and some abstract truth around you. With age you learn to understand the absolute beauty and the absolute truth in science. They are akin to the beauty and truth in art. In other words, with age you develop the sense of scientific taste...What I love about my job now is the many opportunities to surprise others, to make people marvel at your findings. Research gives me a chance to find something amazing that would surprise others.

M(B): After having read science fiction, at the university I dreamt about discovering new elementary particles. I read those books in the 1970s whereas they had been written even in the 1960s. The world was under the impression of the atomic bomb. It

was a period of romanticism, when people thought that physics could do everything. Everyone was expecting a dramatic discovery such as an atomic bomb or laser. Because I was very naïve and silly I sought to unwrap various mysteries of the Universe. But after graduation I understood that it was not my cup of tea. There were not many fundamental mysteries of nature left and one must be more genius than me. On the other hand I understood that there were many other, no less interesting, issues that deserved attention.

For some of them their teenage irrational crush with their discipline eventually turned into a sophisticated and no less sensual passion for it – the passion that supplanted their whole lives and made them see the world through the prism of their scientific domains. This is how they enjoy the ‘sensuous pleasures of intellectual work’ (Savedoff 1985: 313):

M(E): I look at the world through the prism of biology coupled with physics and see the unity in everything. I mean whatever I see I come to the conclusion that everything is interrelated in the world. The world is like the whole unity.

F(B): Created with laser, all these lab works appeal as very beautiful. You know what else I particularly like about physics: it helps you to understand how limited your consciousness is. Especially in quant physics we come across phenomena that are scientifically proven and experimentally verified. In other words, it is obvious that this is the way it should be. Of course, for a philistine mind it sounds absolutely absurd. But neither is for us, physicists! What I am trying to say is the following: it is easy to grasp the information that goes correctly through your physicist’s brains.

M(B): When the clouds are sailing in the sky, I look at them with the attitude of a physicist and think why they have this specific rhythm of motion.

M(Y): If to compare maths with a living organism, the former is the brain, in which the left hemisphere (responsible for logic) is represented by algebra and the right hemisphere (controlling the sensual perception) is geometry. Geometry is beautiful. It absorbs the beauty of the world. You cannot define what beauty is, even if you see it around and recognise its effects. But geometry can show the organization of beauty.

Summary of motivation

As a final note on the motivation for pursuing an academic career among my informants, their choices confirm the six hypotheses by Gross (2002). Having examined the careers of US pragmatist philosophers, he offers six hypotheses to test scholarly motivation: (1) the intellectual attention hypothesis; (2) the intellectual capital hypothesis; (3) the local credibility hypothesis; (4) the social activist hypothesis; (5) the existential scientist hypothesis; and (6) the American (national) intellectual hypothesis. The former three hypotheses reflect the importance of status-based choice, whereas the latter acknowledge the role of intellectual self-concept.

First, according to the intellectual attention hypothesis, the decision to become a specific scholar 'represents an attempt to thrust oneself into the centre of the intellectual attention space' (op cit: 58). Thus M(E) decided to become a molecular biologist because he 'wanted to be in the midst of the Soviet scientific revolution taking place in a high-status scientific domain':

At school I used to love maths most of all. I liked chemistry a little less and biology even much less than maths. Yet there was a scientific revolution in the Soviet biology in the 1970-s. To be honest, the revolution in biology had started already in the 1960-s in the Western world. But its echo reached us only in the 1970-s. All those spirals and other stuff sounded very fashionable and interesting...As I have probably mentioned, I was not particularly attracted by biology as such. I was highly *ambitious* and keen on entering a leading University of the country, in order to deal with a fashionable and interesting scientific domain at the first front and not somewhere at the background. I wanted to be successful and visible in science, no matter where precisely.

Second, the intellectual capital hypothesis says that scholars must 'buy their way into competitive intellectual orientations associated with elite institutions, using as payment their endowments of intellectual capital' (Gross 2006: 58). Resonant with this, F(Q) pinpoints the following criteria, according to which she would like to choose a job place:

A scholar should consider what equipment and publications they [the employer] have. You should enquire about it, very carefully, of

course, but you definitely should. You should figure out publication-staff ratio - in other words, the opportunities to grow.

Third, the local credibility hypothesis means that scholars are moved 'by local reputational considerations and formed their intellectual orientations' at high status institutions of their domain (Gross op cit: 59). 'I wanted to study at a prestigious University', say M(E) and M(S). 'I got tired of Iowa and decided to move to a bigger intellectual area...Princeford', confesses F(D).

Fourth, the social activist hypothesis implies that scholars 'think of themselves as activists working for social or political change' and 'try to get involved in people's problems' (Gross op cit: 59):

M(B): There are so many interesting issues that deserve attention, for example, the process when a rugby ball hits a window. How precisely does it happen when the glass is breaking apart? What is happening during this process? This is not a fundamental question but no one knows the answer for sure. Yet we depend on this answer for the comfort of our lives. This is what we, physicists, should explore.

M(E): When I die, there will be something left by me to people.

Fifth, according to the existential scientist hypothesis, scholars choose their scientific domains 'if they think of themselves as motivated by existential or religious concerns (the meaning of life, the reality of the soul, the existence of God)' (Gross op cit: 60):

F(B): The world is full of enigmas. This is the conclusion we, physicists, often come to. That is why there are very many religious people among us. Compared with other Soviet scientists, physicists get baptised more often and show a keener interest in philosophy. I personally have a perception that everything I do is merely a teeny particle of a vast world, in which there are so many complexities and unknown things. This enigmatic world abounds in things that stand beyond the boundaries of our comprehension. Everything this world contains goes from the Creator! As a physicist, I always see the Creator in this world!

Finally, the national intellectual hypothesis says, scholars 'who conceive of themselves as distinctly...[national] thinkers will gravitate toward' a certain

theoretical school ‘associated with their...[national] heritage’ (Gross op cit: 60). The majority of my informants chose mathematics as the mirror of Soviet intellectualism: in the totalitarian USSR mathematics and other hard sciences were associated with freedom from ideology. M(O) mentions, ‘In my mind’s eye, only a mathematician can be a true Russian scholar because we have very rich scientific traditions dating to the Kolmogorov times’.

Conclusively, my informants’ careers were driven by both the intellectual self-concept and the status-based choice. What the trans-national life has eventually taught them is to incorporate their intellectual self-concept into their status-based choice. On the other hand, the fragmentation of post-modern thinking also allows them to compartmentalise the application of their intellect and intelligence between various status-based decisions.

Progression and accreditation in the Soviet academy

This section focuses on how my informants were entering their ‘temples of science’ as professionals and the measures they were taking to match the official criteria of excellence. To be more exact, I address here their pursuit of research degrees, such as the Soviet PhD (known as ‘Kandidatskaya’ or the first PG thesis) and the Soviet Doctor of Science Degree/DrSc (known as ‘Doktorskaya’ or the second PG thesis), and the consequences of those endeavours for their further careers. I will specifically look at two distinct routes toward their first PhD thesis and highlight the circumstances around their progression and obstruction through that stage of professional development. It is important for understanding how their professionalism was shaping and how it later impacted upon their trans-national careers.

If we consider the college experiences of my informants as the preliminary phase in their career development, or their pre-career; their actual, independent, career started for most of them right after their college graduation – at the age of 22. In the previous section, I looked at their college years as building the fulcrum for their professional future in terms of directing their motivation and establishing their first, and, in many cases, very long-term, professional connections. Here I would like to see how they were taking their first independent steps in the professional world,

beginning with gaining some more specific professional credentials – those above their college degree. To graduate from their academic paradises, such as the MSU, was not enough to stay afloat among the Soviet academic *crème de la crème*. The first credential necessary to confirm this status was the Soviet PhD or the first PG thesis, also known as ‘Kandidatskaya’ or ‘Kandidat Nauk’. The attitude to that degree has been very efficiently summarised by M(B), as follows:

As soon as I started to work at the SAS, the PhD thesis became question number one on the agenda, of course. But it was not a dream. It was part of our routine. A thesis is not something academic people usually dream of. It is just a formal marker, the recognition of your professional status, after which you move on.

There were two routes of entry to the Soviet academia: through the daytime or fulltime PhD programme, with the emphasis on defending the Kandidatskaya; and sometimes through entering an academic institution as a junior staff member, with almost simultaneous either part-time or extra-mural PhD programme. As M(Z) admits, ‘In most cases, we were assigned either to a “box” (a military research institution) or to a postgraduate school. In order to get into the Academy of Sciences, one must have *a personal request*’. And this is how F(D) and M(X) recall their entrance to the academic work:

F(D): After college graduation I was not assigned to work in the countryside, like many others. I was recommended to the postgraduate school.

M(X): I was very lucky to assigned to the SAS straight from college. Of course, my undergraduate advisor Academician A. helped me with that and we were planning to work together in the future.

F(B): After graduation I immediately got to the postgraduate school at the Department of Wave Processes, at the MSU; on the same specialty, which was called Laser Physics.

Below is how my informants describe their experiences of the part-time or extra-mural track, which was a less desired option because it was more time-consuming and sometimes supplemented with life-balance difficulties:

F(X): In 1970 I entered the part-time track, staying on my job, passing the preliminary Kandidat examinations, attending PG classes, and having a two-year-old son.

F(Z): I was engaged in extra-mural postgraduate studies in Moscow at the Institute of Sociology, the SAS, where I later defended my PhD thesis. It was not easy to work and study at the same time, especially when you are a single mother of a little kid. I was divorced and my ex-husband had got married for the second time. So I couldn't count much on his support. Looking back on it, it was tough. Now I think I could bear so many responsibilities on my shoulders only because I was very young – in my twenties.

All my informants got to either route through their family ties and/or undergraduate connections:

F(D): My PhD research advisor was the person who had supervised all my undergraduate term papers in linguistics and the qualifying paper. I had been always very keen on working with her.

F(B): When I was in my final year at college, it was not yet clear for me whether they would admit me to the postgraduate programme or not because there were very many capable people in our cohort. My brother was making frantic efforts to foster my admission to the postgraduate school. Though my brother also deals with quantum optics – like myself – and he knows many people because people usually know each other within their domain. Right before my graduation our cohort tutor suddenly came to me saying, 'Why are not you submitting the application forms? The deadline is approaching!' Eyes wide open, I asked him, 'How come? Are you kidding?' 'No, I am not', he answers, 'We are all expecting you: there is a space for you in our postgraduate programme'.

M(H): Since my junior year, Academician P., who was a Nobel Prize winner, and I had been very great friends. He always remembered me and kept supporting me since then. As a senior student I got to the department of wave processes and decided to have my undergraduate internship at his institution at the SAS. He was very busy at that time and I was assigned to the lab directed by Academician B., another Nobel Prize winner, who became the supervisor of my undergraduate qualifying paper. Isn't it amazing that brought to the SAS by one Nobel Prize winner, I had been working there almost all my life under the patronage of another Nobel Prize winner?

As a rule, their undergraduate advisor was later their PhD supervisor, employer, or very influential reference for the PhD or employment. The effect was that of academic dynasticism – bringing up your own academic tribe or academic stables. Describing this negotiation process, M(Z) mentions a lack of open competition around the daytime PhD entrance:

Everything was arranged from mutual agreement. All that stuff regarding the admission procedures was arranged according to mutual agreement. Your potential advisor usually told the head of the postgraduate school, ‘I know a smart person. I want him as my PhD student. What do you think?’ There was scarcely an honest competition, to be honest.

This intense tribal competition for the PhD entrance shows that the fulltime PhD programme was the most desired option to start an academic career in the Soviet Union because it was a ‘purposeful’ (*tzelevoye napravleniye*) route toward an academic profession. You were recommended by a specific academic department that promised the Communist Party that it would employ you afterwards. Therefore it was very bureaucratised in both good and bad ways. On the one hand, the term of study was pre-determined – 3 years, with the thesis defence no later than a year afterwards. As a result, the majority of my informants received their Soviet PhDs in four years, with the exception of F(D) and M(W), who obtained that degree in three years and one year correspondingly:

F(D): I spent the second year of my PhD programme on maternity leave in the town where my husband’s family lived. Afterwards I returned to my Alma Mater, continued my postgraduate studies there for the consequent two years and defended my thesis six months before the deadline. Here is the chronology of my postgraduate Odyssey: (a) age 22 – PG entrance; (b) age 23 –labour and maternity leave; (c) age 24 – back to studies; (d) age 25 – official completion; and (e) age 26 – thesis defence.

M(W): After college I started to write my PhD thesis at the PG school. Luckily, the thesis was based on my very successful undergraduate paper. I was only 22 and there were not many options to entertain myself in my native town. And because there were no enticements, I plunged into the process of

writing my dissertation and completed it in one year to the surprise of everyone.

M(E): Right after graduation I got to the postgraduate school. Four years later I defended the PhD, which was a rather fast track for my supervisor Professor O's system.

The interviews above show that the Soviet bureaucratization of academic work often facilitated an ascetic attitude to science and ostracism from everyday realities, thus leading a young researcher to an incredible level of productivity as early as in his fulltime PG programme.

On the other hand, bureaucratization often existed to an absurd degree, distracting a person from serious academic work. For example, F(X) recalls having an official advisor, who was 'a very dumb peasant-mentality woman yet a party member – but who was totally ignorant in the topic'; and a non-official advisor Professor B, who was F(X)'s long-term friend and former college supervisor. In addition, the entire process was under the close scrutiny of the KGB under Brezhnev and the head of the department housing F(X)'s PG programme was the 'KGB Major under cover', who 'had bugs under her office desk'. Also F(W) felt 'decapitated' after her PhD advisor had unexpectedly died in the 1980s and no one knew what to do with her thesis because there was no 'officially vacant person to supervise' her project. The dark side of the Soviet bureaucracy in PG education can be manifested in the soliloquy below, reflecting the distracting and obtrusive nature of communist ideology:

M(E): The MSU was the embodiment of everything good and everything disgusting in the Soviet Union. All that existed in the MSU...And there was an absurd system of the communist party leadership...I joined the communist party purely out of career aspirations when I was a postgraduate student [his voice is very calm]. That membership was...[he makes a sad face]...not very pleasant for me...to put it mildly. But because it opened many doors for me, including a research semester in the West and a more rapid promotion, I decided to follow that route.

The long-term process of PhD defence was akin to a 'torture' of going through a multitude of gates, as described below by F(D). Firstly she accentuates the

role of the formative preliminary assessment as preparing a PhD candidate for the on-going 'extremely tough intellectual battle':

To be devoid of any illusions and to become as hard as nails, you should make your thesis test waters. In other words, you should participate in various conferences for young researchers as much as possible to test your findings. It was important to be beaten by your opponents - I mean to get a lot of critical feedback from various sources. Prior to the defence, your thesis was to go through multiple filters such as your departmental colleagues, inside opponents or inside reviewers within your University and outside reviewers or opponents outside your school. There were plenty of reviewers! And to begin with, your thesis was to be assessed by the academic staff from your department. Among them there might be people who were always in the know. They could say, 'Alas! It has been written about already'.

Secondly, F(D) acknowledges a high concentration of academic bureaucracy of the 'perverted, Kafka-style, nature' – the totalitarian bureaucracy associated with a multitude of necessary and unnecessary barriers:

After the internal, departmental, assessment you sent your thesis to the Academic Research Committee (ARC) at a certain department at a certain University. Not every University had an ARC. It depended on how many Full Professors were employed there. As a postgraduate student, you were assigned to a certain University and a specific department to which your specialization area belongs. However, there could be no ARC in this domain within this University. Then you would have your thesis forwarded to another University, which had ARC in your academic area. In my case, the KSU, as the place of my postgraduate studies, had no ARC in Linguistics. Therefore, I sent my thesis to the ARC at the University located in the city where my husband's family lived.

After your thesis had been submitted to the ARC it was under scrutiny by three members of the committee. The ARC then distributed your thesis among outside reviewers from various Universities in the USSR and sometimes in other socialist countries. For example, I had a representative from the Warsaw University. As you see, very many people write evaluation responses to your work.

On the defence day the seventeen ARC members listened to the reviewers' reports first. Then the word was given to the defending person or the candidate. Everyone could ask you any question there, which made the atmosphere very tense. Finally the protocol with the

board decision was sent to the VAK, in Moscow.⁴⁸ And after the successful defence day you had to wait and sometimes for long enough. You had to wait for the VAK conferred the Degree of PhD or Kandidat on you and issued you the Diploma.

Some informants, mostly hard scientists, *purposefully* chose the extra-mural route toward PhD. They were first accepted as staff by a SAS institution and then started working on a particular research problem under the supervision of a senior staff member (who was their undergraduate advisor, in many cases) and defended a thesis after the problem had been solved. As M(H) observes, 'The Academy of Sciences had a peculiar, extra-mural, system of pursuing PhD – the so-called research partnership' (Russian '*soiskatelstvo*'). That extra-mural track was much less bureaucratised and more time-consuming. Such a route was related to the nature of hard sciences, in which it is often 'impossible to determine which topic will be prolific and what might lead to a discovery', says M(X).

Regardless of the chosen route, all informants who got their Soviet PhDs before the collapse acknowledge a very high quality of that education and very severe requirements of excellence. F(B) acknowledges a thriving intellectual life having contributed to her PhD studies:

I attended my first conference as a postgraduate student. It was in 1992, the first year after the collapse of the USSR. It was an exceptional case: I was the first Soviet postgraduate who had got to an international conference in Western Europe. It was a very prestigious and generously sponsored conference for eminent scholars from all around the world and I had initiated very many professional contacts at that conference.

According to the informants, the intensity and the high quality of the Soviet PhD programme was based on totalitarian, that is crude and exhaustive, requirements for academic excellence:

F(X): I was taking Gothic and Ancient English classes twice a week. Then I passed the preliminary examinations: specialty, French and Foundations of Marxism-Leninism. I also wrote two articles, which were published in the *MSU Vestnik/Bulletin*, the journal of the Moscow State University. To have two publications in the *MSU Vestnik* was the minimum

⁴⁸ VAK (Russian) is the abbreviation for the Highest Assessment Committee in the Soviet Union.

requirement for the Soviet PhD. By 1975 I had also written 100 pages of my thesis.

F(D) adds that an essential part of that demand for ‘the highest degree of research quality’ was the *uniqueness* of the PhD enquiry:

I was meeting with my advisor twice a week. My task was to delve into dictionaries and the Russian Bible in search of necessary grammatical structures. In addition, I had to read enormously, always keeping an eye on upcoming monographs of other theses. It was of vital importance to track other people’s theses that were on a more or less similar topic. It was the problem of competition. If you were not fast enough to trace who was exploring an identical issue, another person could leave you behind and take your place by having defended his thesis earlier. That would mean the end of the world: you would have nothing else to do than to bin your thesis. If that happened, people usually either switched to other topics and wrote new theses from the scratch or waited for a long time. To avoid all this, I had to be vigilant. The catalogue with monographic descriptions was issued every other week and all the time I was on the alert, holding my ears like a hatchet. I was aware of the tragic cases when working hard, a person figured out at the brink of the dissertation submission that someone else had just defended PhD on a similar issue, which was a catastrophe for the former.

In the Soviet Union it was strictly prohibited to replicate dissertations topics, even slightly. The State Assessment Committee, known under the name ‘VAK’ would not allow the defence. It was the VAK who put you in line by giving you a register number and determined the exact time of your official defence. If the subject of your enquiry had been already touched upon, the VAK people would simply tell you: “It is too late. The identical thesis was defended under this or that register number”. Or you might hear that from your opponents on your defence day. I don’t even know what would be worse.

As the majority of my informants confess, those crude, yet ‘necessary’, criteria of excellence were carefully ‘nurtured’ by a particular academic mentor. Thus the informants stress the role of their PhD advisors in setting those excellence standards. The excellence was expected to be achieved by any means, including the humiliation and a lack of compromise and compassion coming out from the advisor, who sometimes unexpectedly turned into an ‘academic tyrant’ in the course of that supervision – as described by M(G):

M(E): As I have said, under the supervision of Professor O, it was difficult to quickly defend PhD because there were very strict

requirements for it and because that man wanted to keep *everything* under his control. And never did he understand the words, 'I can't'.

M(G): I was a PhD student in those days. It was very naïve of me to tell my advisor Mr.β about my intent to end up the career of a mathematician and to become a molecular biologist. He said to me, 'OK, go ahead!' I was lucky to have completed my PhD thesis by that time, which allowed me to successfully finish my post-graduate studies and defend my thesis in a timely manner. I am saying this because what had actually happened after that conversation with Mr.β might have had detrimental consequences for my career. Though visibly very supportive of my decision to quit pure mathematics, Mr.β actually suggested at the departmental meeting that I should be expelled from the postgraduate school. He explained his attitude by the fact that I had stopped doing mathematical research and writing articles. Writing articles was very important in the Soviet academy.

However, M(G) and also M(S), who used to complain about the zero-tolerant perfectionism of Mr.β, eventually turned into PG advisors of the same 'perfectionist brand':

M(G): In the Soviet Union I had the reputation of a Professor whose PhD students were always successful. And it was a really hard job to keep them disciplined.

M(S): MY wife once told me, 'Look at yourself. You were complaining about Mr.β and what are you yourself doing now? Just think about how you yourself are talking to your own PG students! You are humiliating them just as Mr.β was humiliating you'. You see, an apple does not fall far from the apple-tree. Who would have been I without Mr.β's rigid control? And who would have been my PG students without it? PG students need discipline. It is very important in science. Otherwise they will turn into craftsmen. Now I am very thankful to him. He helped me to understand – and I see it now crystal clear – that inspiration does not come to you every day. Therefore, you must learn to appreciate its visits as early as in your PG programme. That is why you need discipline. Otherwise, the inspiration will slip and not come back soon.

This is how M(S) – now Doctor of Science (DrSc) and Full Professor himself – has come to approach his own PhD students, whether in Russia or in the USA. He

thinks that this ‘inexorable cruelty’ enabled him to raise ‘so many Soviet PhD students...who later became DrSc themselves...doing the same with their own students’.

As I have already mentioned, the majority of my informants are holders of the Soviet PhD because it was a conventional requirement for staying afloat in Soviet academia, especially under Brezhnev and especially in Moscow. The *Kandidat Nauk* was just the first serious step in the academic career progression, which, nevertheless, paved the solid platform for further professional growth – where ‘the talent did not need to be pushed’, says M(S). However, only four men among my informants, including M(H), M(G), M(S) and M(Y) are holders of DrSc. M(H) is a physicist whereas the rest are mathematicians from the MechMat-MSU.

The way my informants look at the DrSc, it was not conventional for surviving in the Soviet academia, however, among scholarly giants it was an indicator of a totally new intellectual level – a key to the high culture of science. For M(Y) and M(S) it was an “organic culmination” of their “seven-year old intellectual ordeal, related to solving an equation that had been disturbing and arresting” them day by day (as M(X) mentions). In the opinion of M(X), it is ‘unimaginable – just impossible – to predict your DrSc. It just happens to you when you are intellectually ready for it. And what exactly happens is that you are sitting on an equation you are in love with for years on end and suddenly – Eureka!!!- You’ve got it and you just let others know that you are ready to officially to submit it as your DrSc work. All you have to do then is just to put it all together on paper very fast – just within several months – and that’s it!’

M(H): What is the Dr.Sc. thesis? It is the development of a new scientific domain. What I had done by that time was recognised as a new domain in physics, worth of becoming the platform for the on-going Dr.Sc.defence. There are people who, having worked in the SAS for all their life, still did not manage to defend their Dr.Sc. only because they had not been lucky to get into the right research direction. You can see that having worked on one topic for several years, I suddenly understood that I had developed that topic to the level matching the Dr.Sc. Everything is as simple as that!

At the same time, M(G) came across bureaucratic obstruction in the process of obtaining the DrSc – the barrier related to the Brezhnev regime:

I was 40, which was late for a mathematician. I had such a long period of scholarly silence between my Russian PhD and Dr.Sc because of the intellectual “breakdown”, when I had been undergoing transformation from a pure mathematician to an applied mathematician. Besides, the State Assessment Committee (SAK) had been restructuring in those days. In the course of that reorganization, I was feeling uncomfortable about defending my Dr.Sc. It was a seven-year break or a seven-year period of academic abstinence, when almost no one defended the Dr.Sc.

The two stories below, the cases of M(Y) and his teacher Dr. Iceberg, evidence another example of DrSc obstruction, emerging as an outcome of the totalitarian regime, Soviet anti-Semitism and academic tribalism all together - phenomena highlighted in detail later in this thesis:

M(Y): My teacher and PhD advisor Dr. Iceberg, an outstanding mathematician, failed to defend the Dr.Sc. in Moscow. It was a very sad story. Living behind the iron curtain, people did not even accept the idea that somebody could write a response from abroad whereas Dr. Iceberg submitted an admiring response from the US to his Dr.Sc. thesis. It was a letter from a famous American mathematician and, of course, no one in Moscow welcomed that fact. Iceberg was naive to have shown it to the committee. To pass the Dr.Sc defence one must get 2/3 pro-voices. At the defence Iceberg got one voice less and failed the board. Of course, he tried to pass it again and again and nothing came. It lasted for 10 years. The principal, a very nice person and a talented scientist, was fighting for Iceberg. To save Iceberg, the principal kept organizing meetings and gathering various responses. But even that did not help. The crux was one single man from the State Assessment Committee. His name was XXX. XXX's wife was from the Moscow crème de la crème and an ardent anti-Semite. To match the expectations of her circle, he kept implementing the anti-Jewish policy. Though Iceberg told everyone that he was from the Swedish people assimilated in Russia, Russian Swedish; XXX considered Iceberg a Jew, toward whom that henpecked hubby had only one attitude – to impede and squash! It was happening in the 1970s. Unfortunately, Iceberg failed to defend his Dr.Sc. in Moscow. He received many positive responses on his Dr.Sc. thesis, which made his situation even worse: one cannot fight the city hall. Finally,

Iceberg managed to become Dr.Sc. in Leningrad...Iceberg was my PhD supervisor and I was said to be his disciple. The MechMat leaders kept repressing not only Iceberg but also his kindred spirits and former students. Since I never denied my friendship with and always expressed my admiration of him, I was told in very plain words that I would never obtain the Dr.Sc. while in Moscow. As Iceberg's disciple, I could not defend my Dr.Sc for a long time either. For that reason I was denied admission to the doctoral programme. I defended my Dr.Sc thesis in Novosibirsk as an independent research fellow but not as a doctoral student.

How did their lives change after they had defended their PhD or DrSc degrees? Firstly, they got a slight increase in salaries. 'There was no change at all in the nature of my work after the PhD defence', says M(X), 'I only started to earn a little more than before'.

Secondly, their careers were marked with a higher step in their vertical mobility: toward Senior Instructor and sometimes Associate Professor at the MSU or toward Researcher and Senior Research at the SAS (after Kandidatskaya) and toward Associate Professor and sometimes Professor (after Doktorskaya):

F(Z): After the defence I was immediately promoted to Senior Research Fellow.

M(E): I defended the PhD...and got the Junior Instructor position at the same department in 1982.

M(X): After the PhD defence I was rapidly progressing at Landau. I immediately became Junior Research Fellow and then Research Fellow.

F(B): When my postgraduate programme was finishing, I suddenly received an offer from Czechoslovakia saying that they were running a project on quantum cryptography.

M(H): It was a new period in my life. Having defended PhD, I became a rank higher immediately afterwards. I was promoted to Senior Research Fellow. I became the leader of a working group. In other words, I got my own laboratory and started to run people. I was responsible for the development a specific domain. For me it was a new problem area, radically different from that of my PhD. We succeeded a lot in that direction.

However, those degrees as such did not guarantee career success in the USSR. It was dependent on other factors. As M(G) mentions, 'After the Dr.Sc defence...it was still a semi-hungry existence. I taught as a part-time professor and also used any chance to teach'.

M(Y) testifies a very insignificant degree in his Soviet vertical mobility after the DrSc defence:

The DrSc degree wasn't one of the main events for me. Even as a Dr.Sc, I did not lead a dolce vita because I always abstained from voluntary pro-communist work. I had not been promoted toward the Associate Professor position for a long time. Even as a PhD holder, I had been Senior Instructor at that Evening Institute. I became Associate Professor only after the Dr.Sc defence, which was lower than the level of that degree because a Dr.Sc person should be Professor.

He attributes this situation to his refusal to match communist ideology, 'They kept saying that I had not been ideologically ripe enough; not active enough as a builder of communism; not loyal enough to the Soviet power'.

Also due to a variety of reasons, the respondents' vertical mobility was supplemented with horizontal regression to more marginal academic places, as in M(S) and F(D)'s cases. Still all informants declare that their Soviet credentials were unmistakably recognised in emigration and acknowledged as valid credentials by Western Universities. 'All my KSU credentials were instantaneously recognised at Princeford', says F(D), 'So it was worth going through all that'.

Emigration: Before and afterwards

This section focuses on the last three years of the informants' Soviet experiences – on the three years of their Soviet academic career development preceding emigration. The section also examines how the pre-emigration period became the impetus for their consequent exodus and progression in exile.

The last days in the Soviet empire

F(X), whose life story was presented at the very beginning of this chapter, is the only one among my informants who emigrated long before the collapse of the Soviet Union. She emigrated in 1978 – the time related to the prime of Brezhnev or stagnating socialism. This is what was happening to her before the departure from the country:

I got an English instructor position at the MSU, at the faculty of journalism. My ex-husband had been teaching English at the department of economics. The University was considered the ideological front, the ideological battlefield, for bringing up the younger generation. And people saw it crystal clear that as soon as their emigration projects became discovered they would lose everything. They would lose their jobs and would never again get a teaching position at the University, if their emigration plans went West. That is why there were *not many* people like us: we were *exceptions* and we had to keep our mouths shut. I also understood that I would not only let my advisor, an innocent creature, down but also fail the whole department. If that had happened there would have been raised a question: how could you fail to see that the enemy was at your gate! Well, that was life. Of course, I could entirely conceal everything, defend my thesis and get PhD. But there would have been a devastating scandal, after which both the department head and my advisor could be easily thrown away from their jobs. In 1977...a year before the prospective departure from the country, we - my husband and I - decided to quit our jobs...we simply quitted and started to live on private English lessons... We were shivering with fear every single day because my husband, the official breadwinner and the head of the household, could have been arrested for the element of idleness. If you did not officially work in the Soviet Union, it was a violation of the law. And, of course, we could be punished for giving private lessons. So we had to be very careful.

As is evident, she had a very stable and long desired job at a very prestigious place, where nothing forecast an economic disaster. And writing her PhD thesis in that paradise, she was actually at the brink of defending it. However, she and her husband decided to emigrate as dissidents (in spite of their stable Soviet careers) for the reasons explained later (in the next chapter on insight reflections). And that decision evoked detrimental consequences for them. Her story actually reflects her *free choice* rather than an unpredictable calamity and mostly characterises her *moral values*. In a stable job and under the conditions of communist ideology, she dared to

plan her emigration. It was very risky and therefore, she had to be extremely careful. First of all she thought about her colleagues – and not about herself. That is the only reason why she resigned. She decided to sacrifice her career for the sake of the others. She did not care about the communist party, with its ideals. She cared only about the people she personally knew. And acting as a dissident, she tried to do as little damage to her ‘neighbours’ as possible. And here I must say that her academic records stopped at the moment of her voluntary job loss. Her voluntary job loss put her life in jeopardy. Unemployed, she had to live on private lessons, which were considered illegal in the Soviet Union. Her last days in the Soviet empire were the *underground* life of a *Soviet outlaw* in the very direct meaning of this word. She was engaged in an illegal activity and she was doing it in secrecy. If discovered (which might very well have happened, as it did in many cases), she could go to jail instead of the ‘promised land’.

F(X)’s pre-emigration case is an exception. The rest of my informants were far from persecuted by the Soviet regime. They *were* living in a state of chaos – like on the island of Aeolia – because their pre-emigration fell during the perestroika or the ‘wind keeping’ activities of Gorbachev.⁴⁹ However, it does not necessarily mean that they were living badly. Some of them were quite content with their lives. For example, M(S)’s emigration followed his rapid and fantastic progression in the USSR. It was so incredible that his ‘head went crazy with success’:

...at a very prestigious laboratory...I was working under the mentorship of Professor P., my favourite teacher, my best friend and a remarkable scholar... the transgression into the biomedical domain, where I was progressing very efficiently because I was the Leading Research Fellow at the cardio centre. I was only 34 when I had got that position. Just imagine: I was just 34. I went to my first conference abroad and got there a job offer. I felt like the whole world was at my fingertips.

F(B) confesses too that she had been quite a success in science before the economic deterioration, ‘It was in 1992, the first year after the collapse of the

⁴⁹ In the ‘*Odyssey*’ Homer (8000 B.C.) represents Aeolus, the wind keeper, as the mortal ruler of the floating island of Aeolia. He gives Odysseus a favourable wind for his voyage and a bag in which the unfavourable winds are confined, but Odysseus’s careless companions open the bag, releasing the winds and driving their ship back to shore.

USSR...I successfully defended my PhD (Kandidat Sc.) and started to travel abroad’.

M(X) was also very well employed and quite content with his new vagabondage, as his soliloquy below shows:

It was an *amazing* institution! ...I had been working there for a long time until all that started to break apart. On the other hand, I got many chances to travel abroad. I started receiving many conferences invitations...I started to go to Italy, Germany and America. I kept visiting various places. That *dolce vita* lasted for long. I was divorced, as free as a bird, then. That is why I did not find it necessary to emigrate. I spent half of the time abroad and the other half in Moscow. Suddenly I understood that life was becoming worse and worse in Russia. And then, I got married again and ceased to lead the life of a bachelor. In a nutshell, it became important that I should settle somewhere. I started to search for a permanent position in the West.

His pre-emigration life can be summarised as follows: divorced and free from any ties, still in a good Soviet job but travelling a lot due to the perestroika and therefore ‘fruit picking’. The change of attitude came with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the consequent economic hardships and a new marital status.

M(G)’s pre-emigration life was affected by institutional restructuring and, as a result, he found himself in a variety of jobs after his stable and progressive career in the USSR:

I was the Chief Research Fellow at a lab at the MechMat. Kolmogorov’s lab had been erased by that time. He himself did it because he was old and found himself incapable of running his lab. At the same time he had no disciple who could manage such a huge body. That is why the laboratory split into a multitude of micro labs at different faculties at the MSU. I transferred to one of such filial labs at the MechMat. I also an adjunct lecturer at the Bauman Institute and a guest lecturer at the MechMat. I was fired from the Moscow State University in 1995.

M(Y)’s pre-emigration period covers his DrSc defence, followed by the perestroika. The latter brought in great expectations and optimism into his ‘dull Soviet life’ and ‘a belief in healthy future’. He tried an entirely new job, related to commerce and making money, in which he did not manage to stay due to the Soviet collapse and ‘disillusionment’:

As soon as I had defended my Dr.Sc thesis the perestroika started, bringing in many expectations and a huge wave of optimism. Everyone started to believe that once the Soviet power had collapsed the normal life would emerge. We made an effort to organise an applied research centre, in order to write books and teach students and postgraduates independently. I moved out from the Evening Pedagogical Institute to that Centre. We were obsessed with quite a fashionable idea of economic conversion, which meant the conversion of our economy from the military race to peaceful applications. The design of a new economic platform demanded various mathematical calculations. Newborn Russian businessmen got interested in our centre and began to donate us money. However, those were sand castles. For some time we were on the wave that rose after the Soviet power collapse. Soon everything started to decline very rapidly and we found ourselves in the deadlock.

Some of my informants, including M(H), were working for the military structures after the USSR collapse. They have very bitter reminiscences about that partnership, as if they had been forced to do something dirty and morally repulsive:

When the Soviet Union broke down and the state budgeting was over, I had to search for money on my own. By that time I had got access to the circle of people who were keen on sponsoring the continuation of my research...Those were military programmes [His voice becomes gloomy. The expression of his face makes it clear that he feels very uncomfortable about the issue]...In the Soviet Union I worked only in the SAS. Yet after the collapse I also collaborated with many other organizations. They were the clients of my research. In the Soviet Union such programmes were administered in a centralised manner, through the Academy of Sciences. The Academy of Sciences allocated money for the research to fit such programmes. Recently these programmes have been promoted without the participation of the Academy of Sciences as a mediator. The military sector is the direct sponsor of such projects.

Another informant M(B), also involved in military scientific projects during the perestroika, confesses about a high price he was to pay for that 'easy money':

The main principle was that the clients, the military structures, were providing the *so-called* talented young researchers with pseudo orders, which was just insinuation! The young researchers pretended to work and got good money for it. They got plenty of cash, a substantial part of which was returned to the clients. The military structures were very generous sponsors because there was a *huge amount* of money in their bank accounts. The only problem was to

convert that money into cash and start spending it. That is why they invented those projects as a powerful mechanism of money conversion. The youth immediately rushed to that academic fruit picking. It was a societal boom: everyone was keen on earning as much as possible. No one remained squeamish. It was funny and at a certain moment we even started to feel what it was like to have dough. As soon as I had understood that I was being bogged down by that enterprise more and more, I decided I must flee.

In the majority of my cases, the working conditions impacting upon the informants' lives substantially deteriorated during the last three years of their stay in the USSR – and mostly due to the hovering collapse of the Soviet empire, when they started feeling unprotected and lost, as if they had no other choice than to leave the country:

M(Z): Suddenly it became evident that there was nothing to live on after the Soviet economy had collapsed. Besides, the everyday life was an additional impetus. It was the time of turmoil and an increasing expectation of danger. People started to feel in jeopardy.

M(H): In 1998 the last people who had been supporting my experiments said that they had no money to sponsor me anymore. At the same time, there was a grant for me here. In other words, I had no choice. I had either to stagnate there without money and without intellectual work or to start working here. I was not especially keen on emigration. It was a purely situational objective.

F(B): I did not have an adequate salary. During the last year in Moscow I ate mostly bread and tea. And I was sometimes invited to my friends', where I could eat something as a guest. I had nowhere to live. For the last year in Moscow I changed eight places of living, to where I was allowed by a friend of mine out of compassion. I was left for the mercy of my Moscow friends because my salary was not enough to cover the flat rent. It was so humiliating.

The vagabondage experiences of my informants started with their conference and other business trips, that is prior to their emigration. The perestroika became the rehearsal of their final departure:

- M(E): Perestroika...many conferences invitations...I started to go to Italy, Germany and America. I kept visiting various places.
- F(B): I had attended my first conference as a postgraduate student. It was an exceptional case: I was the first Soviet postgraduate who had got to an international conference in the Western Europe. It was the conference in Switzerland.
- F(Z): During the perestroika...I was travelling around the world a lot, attending various conferences.
- M(Q): My first trip abroad...it was a one-month seminar trip to the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. It was the time of beginning changes in Russia, the late 1980s. After I had returned from there, I understood that I could not live in Russia anymore.
- M(H): Living in the Soviet Union, I travelled a lot. In 1985 I had my first conference trip to the GDR [the German Democratic Republic]. It was the *crème de la crème* conference in Dresden. That annual conference was exclusively for the academic elite and was chaired by my SAS boss for many years...In 1991 I got to a big international conference in Edinburgh and met one professor, my future emigration connection and employer, there.
- M(J): For the first time I came to the West in 1979. It was a conference in Italy. The next trip to Europe was in 1986. In 1989 I travelled to America on a nine-month research grant.

Emigration routes and post-exilic career

The act of their emigration took place under the following circumstances. Some people, including F(X) and F(D), left the country because of family circumstances only: as their lives were not generally altered by any socio-economical changes. F(X) left the country as the wife of an Englishman whereas F(D) went 'fruit-picking' to save some 'pocket money' for a flat.

Others came to understand that they were not fitting the new requirements of educational commercialization:

- M(B): I understood that at my workplace there wasn't and there couldn't be any science at all. I knew it would become much worse. I think I would have not continued to do science there. I don't think I would have managed to stay afloat in science

there. I would have become not even a businessman but a businessman's courier or a businessman's lickspittle. And I wanted to be a physicist and nothing else.

Still others, such as M(B) decided to 'flee' because he had got into trouble, in relation to the same kind of commercial activities. Thus the majority of emigration cases were affected by the advent of the Soviet market.

The informants admit that they simply wanted to improve their living conditions and to see the world, which had been closed for them for a long time:

F(B): When I was leaving I was initially driven by a desire to save a little money for a tiny studio in Moscow. Most of my emigrating colleagues either had no place to live in Russia or had to live together with parents in a small 1-bedroom flat. The same old story – the poor material base! It is the main reason for emigration. Our salaries were RIDICULOUS.

M(E): We were suddenly released...instantaneously fizzed out from the uncorked bottle of champagne. Our brains were like the Djinn released by Gorbachev from the ancient bottle. We flooded into various directions because the river obstacle had been torn into shreds. We wanted both to see the world and to make careers.

In some cases, such as those of F(B) and M(J), the decision to emigrate was arrived at not without hesitation or pain. Family pressure also mattered. Various circumstances impacted upon such choices. For example, F(B)'s final decision in favour of emigration was facilitated by the miniature scientific revolution in physics and the consequent opportunity for career development rather than by a purely economic enticement, whereas M(J)'s choice was mostly determined by his wife:

F(B): I had initiated very many professional contacts since that conference. I was constantly written to and offered working places abroad. However, I said, 'I *don't want* to go abroad!' I did not respond to any letter. I burnt the bridges! When my postgraduate programme was finishing, I suddenly received an offer from Czechoslovakia saying that they were running a project on quantum cryptography. I was hesitating with the reply and again decided that I *did not want* to go abroad. But the thing was that in the early 1990s quantum optics was merging into a new area - Quantum Information - that is information transfer based on specific quantum characteristics

of light. It was a great turning point in physics! And my Moscow boss finally persuaded me into going there.

M(J): In 1989 I arrived in the United States on a nine-month research grant. The Institute of Theoretical Physics at my host University had been just opened, and I was offered a permanent job there. When I was offered that extension of my grant trip, I did not decide to accept it instantaneously. The reason for such doubts was the loyalty to my institute in Novosibirsk, where I had grown up. It was my wife who impacted upon my decision. Actually the final word was hers. She came to visit me for a month, then returned to Russia and left her job in Novosibirsk, where she had been Associate Professor and Departmental Deputy Head, by the way. Thus the bridges had been burnt.

Summing up, my informants started packing for abroad as soon as they realised that they could not earn money in their traditional academic labour and did not want to switch to another, commerce-bound, occupation. As M(Z) and M(B) acknowledge, they did have a chance to switch to commerce entirely and that would have been materially beneficial for them.

Here we come to evidence of the conflict between professional identity and national identity. For example, M(X) declares: 'As far as I can see, our country is not really keen on taking care of its academics'. This clash between two roles (professional and national or 'professional patriot' versus 'Russian citizen') caused the identity crisis. 'Everyone knew that everything was a hype', says F(Q). 'I began to feel like I was being buried alive when I heard about the USSR collapse on the radio', confesses F(Y), 'I kept asking myself: What are we supposed to do now? Restructure again and toward what? I just could not stand it anymore'. This identity crisis was solved through emigration and the solution has been summarised by M(S)'s statement, 'If my country does not want to take care about me and my family, if my country does not need me anymore – I will find another place for myself'. And he did so.

The early post-emigration trajectories of my informants derive from their border-crossing routes. And here we may observe the following six cases: (1) dissident track (F(X)); (2) tourist track or escape under the cover of tourism (M(B)); (3) fellowship track (F(D) and F(Z)); (4) Western PhD track (F(W) and M(O)); (5)

PostDoc-through-connections track (M(E) and M(Z)); and (6) tenure track (M(G), M(S), M(J) and M(Y)).

As a dissident in the very direct meaning of this word, F(X) applied for a refugee visa through the US Embassy in 1977 and in 1978 was accepted by the Jewish diaspora in Chicago. She came to America forever, together with her nuclear family, and on the grounds of her Soviet Jewry. She admits the initiation of her emigration route under the influence of her Moscow friends who had left for Boston several years prior to her. Her first eight years in the US were the life of a dissident and a refugee: temporary marginal jobs and a complete abstinence from academic work – downward mobility. And she finally got back to academia only by chance. Recalling the process of the visa application, F(X) mentions that the chances of being denied the visa were fifty-fifty and that in the worst case, she and her husband would have turned into ‘refuseniks’ – a very undesirable social category in the Soviet Union. Another informant of mine, M(Z) observes, ‘To be able to emigrate from the Soviet Union, one must be a *daring* person. You must be ready to put everything on the nail’. He further remarks that though ‘emigration was being constantly discussed in some Soviet Jewish families’, the majority of Soviet people preferred ‘to be handcuffed to the Soviet routine’, like his father. So F(X)’s path was ‘very exceptional’ among Soviet academics in the 1970-1980s, as she herself acknowledges.

M(B) also decided on dissident emigration – that is, on leaving Russia for Israel forever. Because he was single, he went there on his own. Like F(X), he also acknowledges the role of émigré connections and propagandists in the facilitation of his exodus, ‘I had several friends who were spreading pro-Israel propaganda in my circles [the SAS]. It was them who intoxicated me with the idea to emigrate’. However, unlike F(X), he did not apply for the emigrant visa through the Israeli Embassy in Moscow:

The official way seemed very lengthy, ominous and uncertain to me. There was a chance that I could be denied the visa. Besides, I was to go there alone because my parents did not share my intent. They are still in Russia. I did not want to scare them and I wanted to avoid all that red tape. I did not want to get into all that mud because in those days I would have immediately lost my Russian citizenship, which would have been very humiliating and painful. It was 1991. I would

have been kicked out of work. It would have been a very time-consuming and stressful process.

That is why he went to Israel as a tourist and then stayed there. In other words, he simply 'packed the rucksack, bought a train ticket to Greece and left Russia as a tourist'. In Greece he bought a \$ 100 ship pass to Israel. Because he had relatives in Israel, the relatives from his mother's line, he stayed at their place and applied for PhD at Israeli Universities. After the PhD completion, his career developed in the very traditional Western pattern: PostDoc in the US, Assistant Professor in Israel and then Associate Professor in the US. Thus he switched his vagabondage trajectory from a 'tourist refugee' to the Western PhD track. His recent appointment was facilitated by his connections within the Russian scientific diaspora.

Two of my informants, F(E) and F(Z), got to the West through the fiancée visa. Thus F(E) applied for this visa in 1990, got married in the US and then applied for the US PhD, with the consequent track of an American scholar. She is a contract researcher in New York - a 'con artist', as she says. Her husband is her college sweetheart from the Soviet Union, a Jewish man who had immigrated to the US as a dissident a couple of years earlier than her.

While on a short-term fellowship in the UK, F(Z) met her future husband there, returned to Moscow, applied for the fiancée visa through the British Embassy and having received it, left for the UK for good. She started her British academic career as a post-doctoral research fellow, having eventually reached the position of Reader.

F(W) and F(O)'s journeys to the West began with their application for the UK and US PhD:

F(W): I applied to British Universities for PhD and got to the Strathclyde University in Glasgow. In 1992 I completed my PhD thesis and found a job in the UK - first as a PostDoc, then as Lecturer. Now I am Reader of Russian Studies. This is my story.

M(O): I applied and got to the PhD programme in America, at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. While in America, I also

defended my Russian PhD thesis in Moscow. Then I defended my American PhD in Wisconsin. A friend of mine, a professor from England, helped me to get a lectureship position at his home University.

M(E) and M(X) started their Western careers from the PostDoc positions. M(E) had got that position through his prior conference connections whereas M(X) applied for his postdoc through the open competition advertised on the Internet.

The cases highlighted above show that after a person had obtained the postdoc position, following either the Western PhD or the Soviet PhD route, he or she was automatically placed on the traditional western scholarly track – the progression toward professorship. M(O) confesses about having undergone a career crisis while on that track, which, nevertheless, culminated with his return to the steady academic path:

Suddenly my impeccable linear trajectory started to daunt me. That unswerving trajectory began to dispirit me badly. I felt weighed down. I started to feel moribund. I did not feel that I could, at least, somehow affect my own fate. Everything seemed predetermined for me. I chucked that permanent position. Everyone was profoundly shocked in Liverpool. They had not expected me to do it. I myself knew that I was failing that friend of mine, who had pressed the department to hire *me* instead of the other candidate. Still I left Liverpool for the United States. I had friends there who helped me to settle down and get an applied mathematics firm in Boston. That returned me to life. I cooled my nerves down because I understood that I could be the master of my own life...I spent a year in Boston. That was a year of freedom. I like Boston very much. Having overcome the crisis, I understood what I wanted. After that I spent another year at the PostDoc position in Atlanta, at the university of Georgia, and got a permanent position here in the UK.

The informants acknowledge that their acceptance by the global academy is a tribute to their Soviet credentials, often underestimated in the USSR. In all cases, their Soviet PhDs were recognised as equivalent to a PhD from the US and the UK. On the grounds of his Soviet PhD, M(J) was even appointed as Professor of Physics in a very prestigious American University.

M(S), M(G) and M(Y) were personally invited to hold the Professor position in the US and the UK as a tribute to their DrSc, though in the Soviet Union they were

having a 'semi-hungry' maquiladora existence in multiple jobs. 'In the US I finally started to feel like a normal professional – not like a second-class craftsman', says M(S), 'Fortunately, Americans know the real price of scholarly brains'. In fact, M(S) received his DrSC at the age of 32. However, he got the Professor position only at the age of 50 – after he had emigrated. Similarly, M(G) received his DrSc when he was 40 but became fulltime Professor only at the age of 55 and in emigration. He also remarks that as early as at the age of 18 he made a scientific discovery, which was non-officially appreciated in very closed scientific circles. However, the fame was enjoyed by a party member, who was made the official author of that discovery. Though M(G) had some career progression afterwards, it was not as good as he deserved. His input in that discovery was recognised only when he was offered the Professor position in exile years later:

As a senior student, I got really famous in the world of mathematics having solved the task that had been a long-term puzzle for even outstanding mathematicians. I was the pioneer in solving that task, which was known as the Poincare [puankare] puzzle. Because Poincare, a mathematical genius, had been working on that puzzle for a long time, it got the name of "the core puzzle/task by Poincare". However, it was me and not anyone else who found its solution...However, the official award was given to the secretary of our communist party committee. Yet those who were proficient in mathematics knew the truth...Already as a college student, I became sort of famous among professionals and many years later got the Professor position in the USA. In America, I was officially hired as a statistician. However, actually they chose me for those remote research defeats. To be honest, I am much less famous as a statistician.

Summing up the emigration routes of my informants, almost all the participants accentuate the paramount role of informal connections in securing those trips. A very important detail is that those connections were initiated as part of academic life and a tribute to the informants' achievements – as part of their recognition. The informants stress that those connections are also part of diasporic life in scientific world. One of my informants says:

At the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, there is the Institute of Theoretical Physics, whose faculty are 90% Russian émigrés. It looks like *Moscow-on-the-Mississippi*. Having known and appreciated me

for long, they asked me to join them as Associate Professor. Here I am in Minnesota now.

Conclusion

On a concluding note, these people have been in love with their profession almost since childhood and still continue to nourish this love affair. This love only progressed through a variety of imposed barriers and finally led them to emigration. Their academic mobility was largely facilitated by their childhood attachments to their job. Professional patriots, they emigrated because they wanted to stay professional. Though painful, this love affair has been also very reciprocal since all the credentials they had gained in the Soviet Union were immediately recognised in the West and became an essential part of their trans-national career. They would not have had such mobility without all those credentials – that is, without all those Soviet experiences. But do they themselves understand it? This is the question to answer in the next two chapters.

Chapter 6. Findings: Self-perception in exile

Introduction

The discussion in the previous chapter (Chapter 5) highlights *factual* information about the development of the respondents' professional skills. All their experiences have the net result of cumulative advantage in credentials and knowledge. It gained them a place in the global world. In Chapter 6, I further discuss how the informants themselves see this advantage and how they understand their new privileged positioning. The findings in this chapter present the *emotional information* on my informants' life journeys – that is the information about their reflections on their own experiences. These reflections show the most critical moments, events and periods in their lives. These memories help us understand their mobility from an insider perspective since these memories are related to their success and failure in accessing the academic paradise. Here we can see, for example, how specific events, ideologies and people contributed to the informants' homeland attachments and alienation from Russia. And as a result of this alienation, they found themselves in emigration, where the same people and episodes continue to impact upon their new, trans-national, identities, creating what I will further examine as their trans-temporal social place.

Positive memories: 'Academic Eden' and 'heroes'

Referring to my question 'What was the best time and the brightest episode in your overall career?', my informants sometimes found it hard to pinpoint a specific event as the most desirable. However, almost all of them vigorously spoke about their Soviet experiences of college life and/or SAS work as the most prolific professional periods in their lives. This affiliation is a tribute to the high quality of academic work, as early as at the preliminary career stage, and to the informal nature of professional communication.

Reflecting on the best professional time of their lives, the informants' reminiscences cover two basic components of the Soviet academic high culture: *knowledge*, that was of the elite nature, and *people* who were carefully nurturing that

knowledge. The informants' warmest memories thus highlight the principles of the highly fruitful, creative and bohemian industry of Soviet knowledge and the unforgettable images of academic people engaged in that colossal industry and in the foundation of the participants' identities.

The Soviet academy was functioning on two basic principles: *tradition* and *informal education*. Thus the Soviet academic tradition, associated with the credos of *talent search*, *virtuoso* performance and formation of academic stables; was meant to establish lifelong education as a highly prestigious and omnipresent practice in academic life.

The high quality of Soviet academic life has been efficiently summarised by M(Z), who says, 'Rich in events, the Moscow scientific life in the 1980s was of superb quality. It was exclusively intense and active. It was flamboyant. There was an eternal exchange of scientific opinions and there were no distracting grants'.

The informants also acknowledge that the high culture was very specific for and highly popular among the Soviet academic youth because of the idealistic traditions of their up-bringing:

F(X): We were the children of the 60s. The 60s were incredibly liberal. Our life was full of adventures. I mean the circle of my immediate friends. We read samizdat or secret publications though it was dangerous. We were idealistic: we lived in the world of high ideas rather than the world of career making. We were not obsessed with pursuing a career.... We got easily attached. We attended interesting lecture only because we found them interesting. For us, the student life with its communication was no less important than a career for a modern western student.

F(W): We lived in the realm of literature, spoke the language of literature and breathed the air of literature. Russianness for me is first of all the affiliation with the Russian literature. We even developed our interpersonal relations according to the principles drawn from literature. It was awesome. Of course, it was naïve yet cool. There is nothing like that anymore. We had the Pushkin understanding of friendship and the *Decemberist* (*Dekabrist*) approach to love – the attitude of self-denial and thinking about high moral ideas. The behavioural models once borrowed from the Russian literature were deeply implanted into the minds of our generation, the Petersburg youth of the 1980s.

Thus we can see that Soviet college students and young researchers felt emancipated in a very specific way. Substantially deprived by totalitarianism of a chance to make a tangible and gainful career, they displayed an adolescent-like, unsophisticated behaviour of daydreaming and plunging into the shelter of science, which existed as a niche of emotional liberation in the totalitarian state – as in a romantic vacuum. And because this romanticism was torn from the Soviet reality (which will be described later, in the next section), the academic life was perceived by the informants as surrealistic – that is, in terms of ‘cult of science’ or ‘academic paradise’.

The phenomenon of ‘academic Eden’ has been described in literatures as relevant to undergraduate education at a prestigious college (Geertz 1983; Weiland 1995). The stories of my informants also reflect this phenomenon with regard to both their education at the MSU and SAS jobs. Thus the participants often think about their Soviet academic experiences in terms of their entrance to ‘the cathedral of knowledge’, ‘the temple of science’ and ‘academic heaven’. For example, M(H) recalls his undergraduate internship at the FIAN, where he was also later employed for a long time, as something of an unearthly nature, ‘My supervisor let me to his kingdom of laser physics. It was an absolutely amazing tour of all his labs in the FIAN, where he was the God. [He speaks with adoration]. I was in heaven’. Below is how M(Y) describes his feeling about ‘having being allowed to the academic Eden’:

If there could be such a thing as the Cathedral of Knowledge, that was the Moscow State University for me. I was entering it with a feeling of worship every time, as if I was coming into the Temple of Wisdom, the Temple of Science [he speaks with adoration and exultation]. My heart was dancing with joy. I was feeling blissfully happy there. It was the lighthouse for me, my knowledge drug. I was feeling revived and so much alive! The idea of a possibility to simply go there, without any obstacles, to listen to lectures and to make notes gave me a sort of holy tremble over my body. It was an intellectual revival for me.

An interesting fact can be observed from these reminiscences. The informants often think about a very specific academic paradise, as represented by a specific MSU department, such as MechMat (the most popular undergraduate Eden in my cases); or a specific Institute within the SAS, such as Landau, FIAN, or

VSIOM. As mentioned by M(X), 'I mostly affiliate my self with the MechMat rather than with the whole University'.

What imbued a particular academic placement with a sense of paradise was the excellent working conditions, associated with alienation from ideology – that is, with parvenu⁵⁰ as an important pre-requisite of a true intellectual life:

M(X): That was the best academic research institution of the country, the Landau Institute of the Academy of Sciences... That job was a gift of fate. It was a unique institution, the best not only in our country but also in the whole world. There were many unique personalities from theoretical physics at Landau. The working conditions there were just perfect. I mean I never worked in such conditions afterwards and I think I never will. They were just *perfect* if to consider all the factors, such as the degree of freedom. It was definitely a *non-Soviet* institution... There was almost no intrusion of the communist party into it. The staff recruitment was based exclusively on professional qualifications. There was no communist pressure on the researchers' lives. In my opinion, it was an *amazing* institution! We worked at home and met twice a week at seminars, which were also *awesome*. It was a *remarkable part of my life*.

M(Y): That remarkable and sacred academic community [the MechMat] had been out of the party's control for a long time.

F(W): There were some niches where our closed society was open. There were some occasional tiny windows to European civilization.

As all the interviews show, Soviet higher education was based on the tradition of excellence, associated with true scientific knowledge and people involved in its production. Especially at the MSU that high-rank knowledge was represented through grand discoveries and high-rank scholars:

⁵⁰ I use the word 'parvenu' as a derivative from 'parvenue' in the context offered by Bauman (1998). He conceptualizes the parvenue as someone who engages in a journey in order to liberate himself from social and ideological bonds. I understand parvenu as a search for oneself.

M(E): The MSU was the embodiment of everything good...All that existed in the MSU. There were *remarkable* discoveries and *awesome* people.

M(E): In the Soviet Union the concentration of high-rank scholars only in Moscow was as high as in Oxbridge.

That Soviet tradition conveyed a particular teaching format and a respectful, almost religious attitude to studies among young people pursuing higher education. One of the specific configurations of that tradition was the existence and the growth of the Moscow Mathematical School, dating even from the pre-revolutionary times:

M(Y): Soviet higher education was based on certain traditions and on a widespread respect for knowledge. Hard sciences in particular were estimated very highly. They were viewed as the top of scientific knowledge.

M(S): It was *a tradition of the Moscow Mathematical School*: when there was a new article the advisor asked his advisee to make a report at the seminar. The report must contain all mathematical evidence [He speaks passionately]. For the reporting person that was an efficient way to grasp and master a huge amount of knowledge and to help the others to enter that domain...

M(Y): Many good Russian mathematical traditions (close and non formal contacts with students, the system of marking, organization of lectures, tutorials and exams, long mathematical seminars etc.).

The interviews also help to understand how such traditions shape and what factors foster their growth. A particular contributor to the escalation of such traditions can be informal education, like in the Soviet case. Below is how M(Y) accounts for the development of the Moscow Mathematical School:

The main point is why the strong mathematical school developed in the Moscow State University. It happened due to a unique non-formal, friendly, benevolent and stimulating atmosphere that was in the MechMat Faculty in the 1960-70s. Professors, students and post-graduates mutually participated in different events. For example, they backpacked in *pokhods*⁵¹ and attended concerts together. Also professors invited students to their homes etc. I can recall more than 60 research seminars for professors and students, during or after which all seminar members participated in some joint extra-curricular

⁵¹ 'Pokhod' (Russian) means 'a camping holiday' – an essential part of student life in the Soviet Union.

activity (e.g. played football). I have an impression that it was one huge brotherhood. It gave me a lasting feeling of fraternity... Once in a while Mr.β was hiking with us, first-year students, in the forest or in the park. During those walking tours we talked a lot about maths.

The nature of Soviet higher education, as based on small and very stable learning communities, is reflected in these memories about the informal inter-collegiate communication and friendship. And here we can see again how in a totalitarian society closer and more informal relations can facilitate a person's interest in his or her career. F(X) describes her college years at the MSU:

Without a moment of hesitation, I can say that it was the best time of my life. I was fortunately affiliated with a wonderful group of students and later got married to one of my group fellows. In our group we all became great friends. It was a real student life, a wonderful life, with backpacking, camping holidays and the unbelievable delight of socialization. That terrific atmosphere of friendship and nobility instigated me to learn. I started to enjoy every single day while at college.

In their positive reminiscences, the informants particularly stress the quality of college teaching and learning in Soviet Russia. Recalling their Alma Maters as 'temples of science' and 'academic paradises', they do not, however, try to say that the life in those 'academic paradises' was easy and careless. They stress that it was very prolific, in spite of the hardships.

The way the informants think about teaching and learning of high quality is that such a mode was directed toward *discovering talented students* (or turning the average into the talented, which was quite possible in the USSR), who would become *virtuosos* in their areas. M(G) says, 'The MSU had the following principle - to search for talent. Teachers were mostly oriented toward talented students'.

Particularly important in mathematics and physics, the virtuoso performance became the life principle of my informants. For example, M(X) speaks about 'a beautiful manner of solving an equation', comparing it with the 'jeweller's work on a high-carat diamond', whereas M(H) mentions the importance of the 'jeweller's precision in working with hands' for a practical laser physicist.

The virtuoso level of performance was achieved through 'rigid drills', as M(S) mentions, and by means of what the informants identify as 'necessary, needful, or inexorable humiliation'. The virtuoso requirements for scientific ascetism turned

teachers into severe gate-keepers, who used every means to discover the young talent. The informants themselves justify the needful humiliation and view the ascetic educational process of Soviet higher education as the “survival of the fittest”, proudly regarding themselves the “fittest” champions of the true knowledge – as those who have eventually deserved their placement among the intellectual elite:

M(S): I remember a very good system of education, with very serious requirements. We were snowed under with home assignments; over the top. It was *very* hard to learn actually, which was very good because those of us who survived and managed to emerge through the hardships, eventually got a *very* good brand of education. As for those who did not survive, they did not get anything. Well, this is life, cruel yet just: *natural selection* and survival of the fittest. There are students who want to learn yet cannot because they are not organised. They *must* be pressed upon and wound up. Sometimes, when you press upon a student something happens to his brains because you have pressed the right button to open up his hidden talent. Whereas if you do not press, there will be no talent discovery. At the MechMat teachers were very good at discovering and winding up talent.

M(S): Humiliation was part of our daily routine at the MechMat. We often heard from our teachers such phrases as ‘How did you dare not to solve this equation?’ As college students, we heard it all the time. Through rigid drills we were taught to become virtuosos in solving equations whereas here there is no virtuoso teaching at all. Most of our teachers were very spiteful. Yet that spitefulness constituted the overall working atmosphere, which was extremely favourable for capable students in the long run. If you missed something or did learn something properly, you were told in plain words, ‘Enough, Mr. Idler! When on earth will you stop saying nonsense?’

As M(S) recognises and consistently repeats throughout the interview, the high quality of Soviet academic knowledge was based on the no less high quality of academic teaching. That is why the informants recall the images of their teachers, research supervisors and mentors with much affection. The informants enjoyed both the teaching styles and the unconventional, anti-Soviet and original, personalities of their mentors:

M(G): The seminar by Mr.β was the most amiable for first-year students. He was nurturing us more than anybody else.

F(X): I'm very lucky...I had two remarkable teachers. They had absolutely extraordinary, unique, personalities. And they did not fit at all the Soviet context!

The respondents stress the multi-faceted portfolios of their teachers and mentors. For example, M(S) describes the personality of Mr.β as surprising and unpredictable. M(S) points to his teacher's incredible and vast generosity yet spitefulness. However, the pleasures of the informal intercourse with and the fast professional growth under the patronage of Mr.β allow M(S) to forgive his mentor for having been rude and to consider the latter fact as just a side effect of the totalitarian system and as a requisite for career development:

Mr.β was nurturing us, his students, very much. He spent too much time on each individual student. He was a very active person, keenly interested in many things. He made us read enormously and discuss various articles...I was impacted upon by his enormous energy. That was a very *reasonable* kind of energy. He really enjoyed telling us about maths and he did it very zealously. He had a live interest in people and in his students. By the way, it was an awfully spiteful person; just an unimaginably spiteful person [He speaks with admiration]...He never missed a chance to make a poisonous barb...Oh, yes, he had a tremendous sense of humour and he always wanted to tease us. And by wounding us sometimes very deeply he made us feel alive: he made our brains vibrate and work, work, work. I think he had both a sense of humour and an ingrained propensity for teasing and triggering students. But he was an exceptionally kind person. His generosity and compassion were enormous. Why did he help me to get to the postgraduate school? Who was I to him: a brother, a bosom friend? He had a sort of vitality of imagination and enormous kindness. Yet due to that vitality of imagination, he could not help making a poisonous remark.

Another example is represented by M(G), who looks at his college tutor Mr.β as a 'star-maker' and admits, 'In the early years of my career he was my mentor, my academic guardian. Of course, it was Mr.β who created me as an expert, as a mathematician'. And the molecular biologist M(E) keeps marvelling at Academician P.'s virtuoso instruction, who was 'a remarkable scholar and a virtuoso anatomic pathologist of the Soviet times'.

It is not surprising that thinking in terms of academic Eden, the informants imbue their academic 'fathers' and 'grandfathers' with legendary status and regard them as 'academic heroes' of Soviet science. Here we come across the whole chain of such heroes, constituted by Kolmogorov and Dynkin in mathematics, Prokhorov and Basov in physics, Postnov and Ovchinnikov in molecular biology, Grushin in sociology, and Smirnitskaya and Akhmanova in Philology:

M(G): Kolmogorov has been the most legendary figure in my life. As a scholar, he was an *academic Leonardo de Vinci*! And my undergraduate instructor and supervisor Mr.β was an *awesome* teacher.

M(H): In his kingdom of laser physics, whose doors he once opened to me; he was the God of the latest and the most outstanding achievements in laser technology.

The informants acknowledge *the fact of having been noticed* by an academic giant already at college as the turning point in their careers. They also stress that the crucial acquaintance was accompanied with their introduction to a totally new world and to an academic dynasty. Thus the giant not only laid an eye on the informant as a young scholar but also made him part of the expanding academic stables:

M(Y): We had absolutely unique teachers, for example, Mr.β. He gave us *amazing* lectures on linear algebra. He is my *academic granny*: he was the advisor of my advisor. Mr.β lectured first-year students. He also arranged seminars for us, where he usually told us about a new, emerging, domain in mathematics, for example, something from applied maths or theory of probability. After that he gave a series of tasks to solve on our own. If a student was keen in a particular category of task, Mr.β directed him to his postgraduate student Iceberg. Thus I began to study Leigh groups under Iceberg's supervision. And later Dr.Iceberg himself turned into an academic giant and became my PhD supervisor. Dr.Iceberg and I have been great friends since that time.

The participants' evidence suggests that having entered the academic stables, they themselves eventually turned into the carriers of the academic tradition – so the teacher's impact was inter-generational. For example, M(G) says, 'I used to pass Kolmogorov's and Mr.β's teaching methods and ideas to my Soviet students. It was paramount for nurturing and developing the Moscow Mathematical School, without

which *nothing would exist!*' The interviewees also recognise the mentors' impact on their whole careers in terms of choosing a research focus or an instructional mode:

M(S): At the postgraduate school I chose one research direction under the influence of Mr.β. I was very keen on that domain, in which I have been still working. You see he could capture my interest. The suggested domain became the gold mine for me.

M(Y): Mr.β's influence on my professional identity was very strong because his lectures on linear algebra were absolutely amazing. So were his seminars, on which he made reports on various topics. He knew so much! He was an absolutely unique teacher! Listening to his lectures, I thought that I wanted to be an academic person too.

The case of Mr.β, frequently referred to in the interviews, illustrates the influence of the academic paradise on the people who stepped into it. The impact of the Soviet system of higher education upon the respondents' lives was both immediate and long-term. The first outcomes were instantaneously displayed in very fast professional growth as early as at college. And in many cases, the informants refer to this progress as the *'headway toward virtuoso level'*:

M(G): Already during the 1st year of my studies I wrote an article. I also kept attending seminars run by various outstanding teachers, who had inundated the MechMat...As a sophomore, I wrote another article, together with Mr.β. Having become very famous soon afterwards, this article is still very influential in mathematics. Since then I had been treated not merely as a good student but also as a serious researcher with a high potential. As a senior student, I got really famous in the world of mathematics having solved the task that had been a long-term puzzle for even outstanding mathematicians.

M(S): Having grinded mathematics for five years, we reached the virtuoso level of performance.

As I have already mentioned, the interviewees justify the needful totalitarianism in academic work and acknowledge its role in this career progression. Thus M(E) remarks, *'The totalitarianism in science...I think there was some meaning in it. My growth was the most rapid under the Soviet totalitarian regime'*.

The entire impact of the Soviet higher education can be summarised as follows. The Soviet unworthy college system, particularly represented by the MSU in my case, has shaped a person as a professional and pre-determined his or her future professional fate:

M(X): I remember the MechMat as a place where I have lived an important part of my life. It is the place where I have grown up as an expert. I was shaping professionally as a mathematician there.

F(B): I keep very warm memories of the Moscow State University, in general, and about the Department of Physics, in particular. It was a very strong school, which provided me with knowledge and broadened my horizons.

Within the walls of their Alma Maters, the informants initiated very important and long-term relations with their mentors, course fellows and colleagues – the relations based not only on professional collaboration but also on the same level of general perception of life. This perception mode - the ‘Soviet Russian intellectual self-perception’ - is a tribute to the Soviet academic high culture, which was ‘transplanted into [their] blood’ (M(Y)) as early as during their college years:

M(H): Since the moment we first met (when I was a college junior), Academician Prokhorov and I had been very great friends [his face is absolutely happy]. He remembered me and always kept supporting me since then. When I myself started to work in FIAN our relations became especially warm.

F(X): In the course of my life, those two teachers became my mentors and kindred spirits. Professor B - the lady I always refer to in my story - is the *benchmark* of moral values in behaviour for me!

The informants are still in touch with their academic paradises, toward which they constantly gravitate while in exile. And it sometimes accounts for their transnational way of living:

M(G): Some my Soviet PhD students are still in Russia. For example, one of my former PhD students is the Head of the Laboratory and the Administrative Secretary at the Institute of Problems of Information Transfer, Russian Academy of Sciences. By the way, I am still regarded as an employee there. They do not pay me. I send them reports on my research and provide them with

various ideas, thus participating in the academic life of the country. They have also helped me with the paper work around my pension.

M(X): Last year we tried to promote an initiative. We wanted Russian academics working in the West to come to Moscow and lecture an intense course there. We designed a 1.5-month lecture course. Three of us were conducting that course: each person was giving 3 lectures per week for two weeks. We did not ask anything for it. We just wanted to be known.

The intercollegiate relations with people from the same academic paradise often exist on the diasporic level and can be described as the earlier mentioned 'Moscow-on-the-Mississippi' or 'MechMat-on-the-Hudson' phenomenon. As M(G) remarks, 'We, Russian mathematicians in the West, love and support each other. Our mathematical school is something we have been always close to. This connection with the tradition and with the people supporting this tradition has never been lost – even here in emigration'.

Thinking about the extent to which this tradition of academic excellence can be preserved in today's Russia, the informants acknowledge that the societal shifts in post-Soviet Russia have eventually led to fundamental and detrimental changes in academic life. In their opinion, the idealistic system of the omnipresent quest for knowledge could exist only in specific, vacuum, conditions. By now the stagnating late socialism and the emerging market have destroyed that 'prolific vacuum' and severely injured the quality of both the Soviet academic tradition and the academic knowledge. This is how the interviewees understand that lethal metamorphosis:

F(X): The Soviet *anti-pragmatism* was based on the system of ideas and principles. In my opinion, it is related to the *non-competitive* nature of the Soviet society, which is what I like about it. In my mind's eye, it was a great merit! What I mean here is not the lack of competition but the possibility not to be pragmatic. In fact it was possible to pursue your dream! It sounds like a cliché today but Soviet people were *always aiming at something*.

M(Y): Finally communist leaders and their successors succeeded in destroying that remarkable and sacred academic community.

Estimating this shift, the informants mostly abstain from the emotional and permanent physical affiliation with post-Soviet Russia:

F(X): I keep visiting Russia, at least, every other year. Of course, Moscow is not my city anymore. It all has gone by now! It has been *lost*! It is a totally different MSU. Now students at the MSU take part-time jobs because you cannot live on the studentship only. It is not enough. And then, they are extremely oriented toward their future. I feel a *great withdrawal* and *alienation* from the reality of the current modern Russia, the late modernity I am rejecting! It is a totally new reality of post-perestroika, with all those new Russians and Russian marketization. Disaster!

Summing up the informants' memories about the best time of their career development, these memories focus on the Soviet experiences of affiliation with the academic Eden and help to better understand this phenomenon. In geographical terms, these memories describe the academic Eden as the most advantageous place of study or academic work and refer to a specific academic department such as the MechMat, FIAN or Landau. In epistemological terms, the Soviet academic paradise was associated with the *high quality* of academic work in the USSR or with the Soviet tradition of making academic knowledge omnipresent and fostering a virtuoso level of performance. In the next section I will look at the phenomenon of the 'academic Eden exile' through the prism of mobility to a department or institution that is lower than their previous placement, in terms of academic status.

Negative memories

Violence and anti-intellectualism

Referring to my questions 'What was the worst period of your career?' and 'What can you recall as the most painful episode in your entire career?', my informants started to think about their Soviet experiences of undergoing administrative pressure. Their negative memories can be summed up as memories about the political pressure from communist leaders, with which all academic institutions were inundated, the atmosphere of anti-intellectualism, and the lack of

mobility. In other words, those negative experiences relate to the bad working conditions, the poor quality of intellectual work and the psychological discomfort of intellectuals under the Soviet regime. Also the informants think in rather negative terms about the emerging educational market of the perestroika – the time when the Soviet Union was still alive. A particular example of the negative memories is represented by the case of Jewish academics, who recall the experiences of the political, state-sponsored, anti-Semitism in Soviet higher education during the years 1967-1985.

In general, my informants acknowledge that Soviet academic life was a reflection of overall societal life, from which intellectuals were not protected in their ‘temples of science’. The evils of Soviet academic life derived from the evils of the communist regime, penetrating into the Soviet society. Thus M(E) remarks, ‘The MSU was the embodiment of...everything disgusting in the Soviet Union. Yes, all that existed in the MSU’.

For the majority of Soviet academics, especially for those not affiliated with the communist party and truly devoted to science, academic life was full of hardships, such as stress, very high teaching loads and an unhealthy work-life balance. It was particularly challenging for the academic *limita* (see the story of M(S) from Chapter 5), such as M(S) and M(Y); that is, for people who had buccaneered into the capital from provinces and therefore could not count on relatives’ support in raising their children:

M(Y): We were raising four kids without any support from the extended family. In addition, my wife and I were both full-timers. Though I always sought to plunge my mind solely into mathematics and my wife sympathised with my intentions, it was actually not easy. We arranged our schedules in a way that would allow one of us to stay with the children whereas the other could be off for work. Imagine my wife teaching and myself baby-sitting. After she had come back from work, she released me from my baby-sitting shift and by the twilight I had been able to go to the library, which was located at the other end of the city. After I had spent the whole day with the kids, who were very agile and naughty, working in the library in the evening was a very hard load for me. Because my intellectual work was very intermittent at those times, my productivity was consequently very low.

M(E): My Soviet boss died at the age of fifty-four. No wonder: his life had been very stressful.

M(Y): We all earned very little though enough for surviving. You could make a career only if you became a communist party member and began to commit yourself to all that [chooses the word] noddy job. Many people made that choice although far not all of them wanted to be like that...I don't know how to put it [keeps stammers]...there was no freedom of choice, even theoretically. There was no progression in a decent way that you could earn more money and recognition for having achieved something.

In that socialist milieu, the academic career was dependent on affiliation with the communist party. Though the informants display their strong disapproval of the CPSU membership and neglect for the pro-Soviet 'career hunters', some of the respondents still did join the communist party, about which they honestly and sadly confess. In the opinion of M(E), CPSU membership was a rule of the academic promotion game:

M(E): There were also many *scoundrels* and *easy game hunters* (I mean *quick career seekers*). There were people who were eager to make their careers through the party membership. You may say that I was one of such scoundrels. I joined the communist party purely out of career aspirations.

M(H): Now is it has become fashionable to announce oneself in retrospect as anti-Soviet. After the Soviet collapse, many academics suddenly converted into *anti-sovetchiks*. This is just ridiculous! How do you think they managed to make their Soviet careers in the academic world? The communist membership was not the least important factor. As for me...well, I *was there*. Whether I like it or not now – but I *was there*, among *them*, the communists. I was one of the academic bosses. This the road I took and I am not going to lie now.

F(X) says that from the very beginning, acceptance of communist ideology was a pre-requisite for entering the academic career:

The main requirement for the entrance to the daytime postgraduate school at any humanitarian faculty was to have '5' ['A' on the Soviet marking scale] on both the final undergraduate and the entrance postgraduate exam on Scientific Communism. It was said that if you

were not ideologically moulded enough, you did not deserve a place among the Soviet professoriate.

Right after that entrance, the procommunist work, which was both 'voluntary' and mundane, became a paramount criterion for promotion. That requirement was in force both under Brezhnev and during the perestroika, which suggests that the communist regime was dying hard and slowly. That pro-communist work embraced a range of intellectually distracting Kafka-style activities, including PG student farm work and anti-alcohol campaigns. Among a large variety of promotional cases, those activities were particularly relevant to the progression toward Kandidatskaya and to conference travel permission:

F(D): We, Soviet postgraduate students, were not only viewed as those who had to write theses but also as cheap labour force. I was already with child...and in the course of that year I was...to work on the vegetable farm,⁵² to sort out rotten cabbages with our bare hands at a vegetable store, and to participate in the DND⁵³ brigade committing volunteer work⁵⁴ in our University. We, girls in our early twenties, could be easily commanded to hunt for hooligans in the street, in the dark. I was also the monitor of the student song band, which means that I had to set all the decorations on the stage...No one wanted to understand that I had 4.5 months of pregnancy when I was called upon to the University CPSU meeting and blamed for shunning volunteer work under the cover of my pregnancy... Some postgraduates were even made to plough their professors' kitchen gardens. Thank goodness, it did not touch me!

M(Y): If you abstained from voluntary pro-communist work, you could not apply for anything. I started to attend conferences in Germany. In order to attend each conference, I had to ask for the recommendation that had to resume like this, "he is ideologically tested, morally steady and politically competent". Moreover, the wording must be exactly like this

⁵² As a principle of the Soviet regime, students were assigned to work on different farms for nothing. They were used as free workforce to raise the productivity of the Soviet agriculture.

⁵³ A rudiment of the Soviet regime, DND means "people's militia": students were forced to scan streets at night and prevent acts of hooliganism. DND brigades were used to create an image of a secure life in the Soviet Union.

⁵⁴ Soviet 'volunteer work' was of an obligatory nature. Mostly it involved participating in komsomol meetings and pro-communist music/performance bands with the purpose to disseminate the ideas of the Communist Party. Abstinence from DND, farming and band events resulted in poor academic records for a student.

cliché. Had they rearranged the succession of those phrases that would have been the end of your conference activities. You had to kowtow and serve those idiots for the sake of that piece of paper. So nasty. Otherwise, forget about the conference. So humiliating! I was always reproached for abstaining from voluntary pro-communist work. They kept saying, "Your science is more important to you than communism building". Finally, they talked me into some voluntary work under Gorbachev. I was designated Chair of the Sober Men Society at our University, as part of the Gorbachev's anti-alcoholism campaign. My communism building duties consisted of collecting membership money – 10 kop. [=10 p] per annum. That was such a miserable amount that I always donated it from my own purse, which suddenly raised my societal status in the eye of the administration.

The politics of promoting CPSU loyalty among academics remained stable throughout the Soviet years. The closer the Soviet Union came to its collapse, the more absurd the configurations of that mundane vassalage became, thus often creating unhealthy working conditions in the academic industry:

M(Y): The Andropov's reign brought in even much more absurdity. It was all permeating dementia. I mean his senile obsession with total communist discipline. He commanded that everyone, including University teachers, have an obligatory 8-hour working day. He couldn't care less that we, teachers, were to mark lots of students' tests at home, above the workload. He demanded that we spend 8 hours daily at the University. For example, I was scheduled to lecture for 4 hours every day. Where could I get the remaining 4 hours? That was the question to which the communist party committee at our University quickly found an answer. They arrived at the decision to allocate a special room where teachers could sit for the remaining 4 hours. Our faculty was assigned to the cellar, where, to be honest, people mustn't be at all because of the fire hazard and the anti-hygiene conditions such as a lack of fresh air. Yet for the communist party the fight for discipline was much more important than academic lives and health. We sit there telling anecdotes and drinking tea instead of doing serious academic work. This is an example of the Soviet academic life.

In terms of more tangible academic outcomes, the party's attitudes led to the absence of mobility among academics because of the control over access to international conferences and publications:

M(G): For fifteen years they had not been allowing me to go abroad. Once there was a dirty informational fake: someone told on me to the local party committee. Yet that was enough to keep me deadlocked. Of course, it was very offensive when invited to an international conference by outstanding and world known scholars, I was not allowed to go in a very impudent manner...They did not give any explanations. They simply kept referring to one another whereas actually there was the instruction from the above, from the KGB, not to let a particular person go. I was not the only victim of those academic monsters.

M(X): At Landau I had got them [international conference invitations] even earlier [under the Soviet regime] but it had been impossible to go abroad.

M(Z): In the institution where I worked there was a very negative attitude to conference trips. I was told, "Where are you going? Who do you think you are? In our country only *GenSecs* [the leaders of the central committee of the Communist Party] and Ministers go to conferences!" The trip related red tape in the Soviet Union was just a nightmare.

M(Q): In the days of the Soviet Union, I was denied permission to go to a Bulgarian conference. I remember passing the selective interview at the *partkom*. As a result, they did not allow me to go and did not explain why.

In the opinion of M(Y) and M(S), Soviet administrators often intentionally impeded international conference travel on purely personal grounds yet under the cover of ideology:

M(Y): The goal of those *academic bandits* was to commit as many personally disgusting things as possible. In Andropov's reign, I was frequently invited to western conferences. And in order to attend such a conference, I had to go through a long bureaucratic procedure every time. It was so humiliating. Almost every time, the administration hid my official invitation and showed it to me only after the conference was over. *Petty hooliganism!*

M(S): Academic *vampires*, they just enjoyed blood-sucking honest scholars.

Publishing articles in the Soviet Union was another process soaked through with communist ideology. Below is how M(Y) describes a long bureaucratic

procedure around submitting an article for publication – the procedure that contradicted the intellectual principles of normal science:

To publish an article, you should receive the “expertise certificate”. It was a number 1 obstacle for people doing serious research. Every University had Department 1, the Committee of State Safety or the KGB, and the Expertise Committee. Your scientific life was actually monitored through and by those two departments. When you wanted to publish, you had to fill in the questionnaire about the name of the article and many other questions. The main thing was to state that your article had nothing new, no inventions and nothing outstanding. You should declare that it was quite an ordinary piece of writing that would cause no one’s interest. Otherwise, you would not get published. You would not be able to publish anything without the certificate of expertise that was issued by the Expertise Committee. Your questionnaire should be endorsed by all members of the Expertise Committee. There was a scheme of steps you should follow: (1) the Expertise Committee; (2) the “triangle”; and (3) Department 1 or KGB...After the questionnaire had been approved by the expertise Committee, you should go through the “triangle”: the director or the principal; the trade union leader; and the secretary of the local communist party committee. Moreover, they might be totally ignorant of your domain. Yet those people were crucial in decision-making. Their signatures were important. That is why, everything centred around personal liaisons. Afterwards, your questionnaire was directed to the KGB...The main obstacles were the principal and the communist party secretary. If either of them refused to sign your questionnaire, you were not able to publish. Once my article was merely knocked down. It cost me a lot of nerves and humiliation to talk that idiot, the principal who knew nothing about maths, into endorsing that sheet of paper. We all were walking along the razor edge: if you did not get along with the communist party secretary or the trade union leader, you would never publish anything along as you worked there. Changing a workplace was not easy and even if you did, the situation would be the same at another University. You would still have to kowtow. This is how many brilliant ideas were buried alive. Neither could you publish an article with a Western editor. It was prohibited. You could go to gaol [he speaks very calmly, without any emotions].

As M(E) concludes on the party’s violence, ‘The state power kept squashing everything that was ideologically challenging to it. As a result, some scholarly domains, such as genetics, were for a long time impeded and persecuted’.

The impact of the communist regime upon the quality of intellectual work could be summarised as anti-intellectualism with the face of Leninist ideology. That

adverse effect was more than evident in both research and teaching. Soviet anti-intellectualism in research, both fundamental (F(Y)'s case) and applied (F(X)'s case) revealed itself as 'a noddy job', 'stupid work' or 'monkey's business' and lysenkoism or fast and fraudulent results:

F(X): Recalling my employment at a fly-by-night agency at the Ministry of Higher Education...I worked there in 1968-1970... I can only say about that agency, where I worked right after the University, that having a famous name, it was merely flotsam and jetsam. It was called "The Informational Centre at the Ministry of Higher Education". Though I worked there as a research fellow, it was again just a famous title. In fact, what we did there was idiocy and nothing else. We had to annotate and review publications about higher education. I did it in English and French... Oh, God, that enterprise was run on such a miserable level! There were five of us in the department. To be honest, we had absolutely no clue of what we were expected to do. For example, we had to select articles about higher education in the West. For some time I was annotating publications about how language was taught at Princeford. As soon as something informative had been located and, especially, if it described some positive experience the colonel did not allow it into press. It was piled on his desk or rubbished somewhere on the shelves. Like in most Soviet agencies, that work was very ineffectual. The administrators were totally inept to approach this kind of information and western experience.

F(Y): Complete flotsam and jetsam, sloppy work...Our boss had a very weird logic: he wanted to collect all technical tasks into a single database. I don't understand what for! Neither did anyone in our team. Let it be an unexplainable phenomenon of the Soviet regime. With that pursuit in mind, he sent us to various libraries for collecting all existing technical tasks. Finally that data collection became the deadlock: piles of paper were dumped on his desk. We never generalised or compared those tasks. There was no analysis. We just kept collecting them.

The intrusion of the communist party into the process of teaching and learning was perceived in the higher education curriculum and student life, in general, and in the social science and humanities instruction, in particular. As observed by F(X), 'The University was considered the ideological front, the ideological battlefield, for bringing up the younger generation'. F(X), F(D) and M(Y)

recall the negative aspect of their student life as that related to 'wasted time' and 'idiocy', whereas F(Y) and M(G) point to people's schizoid identities:

F(X): The time of my studentship was full of idiocy that you cannot find today, of all those political disciplines we had to study, of all those idiots driving us nuts, of all that spiritual violence and of all those obligatory *komsomol* meetings. Everything related to the ideological aspect of our life was awful. When I think about how much learning time was wasted on all that idiocy...I could have learnt ten foreign languages instead!

F(Y): On the whole, the devastating atmosphere...[chooses the word]...of *dementia*, with all those *komsomol* meetings was personality splitting.

A particularly damaged academic area was that of social sciences and humanities – the domain where the adverse effect of the communist ideology was unavoidable. That is why many of my informants chose mathematics and other hard sciences, as mentioned earlier. The informants acknowledge the omni-presence of pro-Soviet slogans and clichés in the curriculum related to social science and humanities:

M(Y): It was impossible to study social sciences and humanities on healthy grounds because they were all soaked through with Marxism and Leninism and you were forced to reiterate senile phrases such as "the Great Lenin", "the Great October Revolution" or other nightmarish and vomit causing nonsense.

F(D): ...all those words like "the great and powerful Soviet Union, the big brother of all peoples", "the great fraternity of emancipated Soviet peoples", "the light communist future"...

F(Q): Everyone knew it was one big lie. Yet we kept repeating those clichés like parrots. This is what I remember about my 1990 freshman year at college.

A failure to conform to the requirements of communist ideology resulted in an unfairly lower grade during the term exam, which is remembered by some of my informants as the most painful episode in their academic lives:

F(D): It was the exam on the Antique Literature and I was preparing for it very thoroughly though in a very naïve manner. Suddenly I came across the Soviet system of education, in which you should not share your profound knowledge of a

book and, especially, your reflections on it. The system was favourable to those who learned lectures by heart, word by word, and commented upon the literary works from the Marxist-Leninist point of view. I was not very good at it. After I had made the report, the teacher started to throw mud at me and humiliate me in front of my course fellows saying, 'Well, Miss Know-All, did you think that if you were a top student you didn't have to prepare for the exam and to memorise my lectures? Did you think you were smarter than everyone here? I will show you whose word is final!' Then she asked me, 'What grade would you like?' I answered, 'Whatever you think I deserve'. As a result, I got '3' ['C'], a fly in the ointment of my transcript.

F(X) describes the humiliation of her husband, who failed to deliver the party's politics while giving a class:

When teaching English at the faculty of economics, the MSU, my ex-husband gave his student an article from the British communist paper *Morning Star* about the unemployment pay, the on-leave money, for English workers. One of his students occasionally mentioned that fact at home. His father was a very lawful citizen, who came to the communist party secretary of their faculty and reported that their teacher was spreading bourgeois propaganda. My husband immediately was called upon by the department head and asked not to do it again. The department head said, 'The article contradicts the Communist Party line'. When my husband told me about their conversation my hair stood on end. It was societal dementia! It should make a sane person absolutely shell-shocked!

Evaluating the Soviet academy in retrospect, from the position of a person who has lived for fifteen or twenty years in the West, my informants conclude that the Soviet academic life now resembles the Theatre of the Absurd:

M(E): The *absurd* system of the communist party leadership...

F(X): ...the complete *senility!* *Idiocy!*

M(Y): I remember one particular job that was a very weird one from the point of view of common sense. But under the Soviet regime my whole life was akin to a long *Kafka*-style play. Generally speaking, it was a very weird life, full of absurdity. That is why, what I was doing on that job was just a little part of the overall nonsense. All people were staying upside down. That was absurd.

The formation of the late Soviet and early post-Soviet market in higher education substantially added to the unhealthy working conditions. The informants speak about their 'academic maquiladora' experiences of multiple job affiliation, economic deprivation and 'academic fruit-picking' – the activities they find very humiliating after the advent of the new husband:

M(X): Russian academics in Russia keep working in four or five places. And these are very hard, non-civilised living conditions

M(G): ...the semi-hungry existence...

M(S): ...working in three or four places...like academic maquiladora workers...

F(Y): The problem was and still is to survive physically, because the money they earn abroad is enough for the whole family to live on during the summer and the next term. Unfortunately, you cannot be absent for more than a half a year. Otherwise, you will be fired. That's the law! These academic fruit-pickers work on seasonal terms abroad, have some gains and return. The academic fruit-picking money is important for survival. I don't know what is the best name for this phenomenon – academic *shabash*, maybe. Most of my friends are such academic fruit-pickers or academic *shabashniks*.⁵⁵

F(Y) shares a very painful experience of being humiliated as a teacher. She remarks that in the 'thriving' Soviet Union, with all its 'ideological imbecility', University teachers were still respected by their students and their parents. And 'all that ceased to exist' after the Soviet Union had started to collapse, as she further observes:

We transplanted the worst from the Western experience. Everything became commercialised, even things that *mustn't* be commercialised, for example, education. I left the Institute of Civic Engineering because I had been paid very little there and started teaching maths at a private college. I wasn't feeling squeamish about going down to a smaller place because I always loved to work with students,

⁵⁵ 'Shabash' (Russian) means 'seasonal employment'. *Shabashnik* (Russian) is a seasonal worker.

regardless of who they were. I knew I had a lot to offer them. But they were talking to me approximately like this, "My Dad gives you the money and you must explain me your maths!" And they turned their backs to me. They kept saying, 'You must dance here in front of me and entertain me because my dad is your sponsor!' So did their fathers use to tell us, 'We sponsor you and therefore, our kids must get excellent grades'. What they wanted was not knowledge but grades. The commercialization of education created the system in which people with monetary funds believe that they have comfortably provided for themselves: they want to have gains without pains. They believe they will get their diplomas and consider knowledge as garbage. It was very depressing for me. Sometimes I came across really good children among those *crème de la crème* slums. But in general, there were very many elite off-spring, who made my life unbearable. Finally my colleagues started to beat them with their own weapon by saying, 'Our miserable salaries allow us not to do anything. Whether your off-spring know the stuff or not does not bother us'. My youngest son's teachers used to say, 'We are not going to break down because of your children: with our salaries we may not even come'. That damn college was so disgusting!

In the opinion of her husband M(Y), post-Soviet HE became the repetition of the same Soviet 'Theatre of the Absurd':

It is the end of the world, the end of the intellectual world, when the market creates a sort of Orwell society, the-Orwell-style-academy, where a theoretically beautiful idea of equality is driven to absurdity. This is the deadlock!

His observation poses the following question. Has the totalitarian power gone forever or has it been just replaced by the no less cruel market?

Academic non-placement: Academic quagmires and airports

What the informants feel about the most negative stages of their careers can be described as 'feeling non-placed'.⁵⁶ This feeling of displacement was aroused

⁵⁶ For general information on non-places, see Auge (1995). He distinguishes between 'anthropologically rich places' (imbued with particular meaning for people) and 'non-places' (where a person is left neglected and has *no sense of belonging* to any area). Thus the non-place/NP is associated with a sort of identity loss. Applying to immigrant experiences, Weinrod and Levy (2005: 23) clarify Auge's idea by looking at non-places as 'impersonal places...airports and hotels'. In my research I use the idea of academic non-placement in reference to a workplace that contributes to an academic's loss of professional identity. I also believe that academic non-places are constructed through the spread of anti-intellectualism or the violation of intellectualism.

when a person was neglected as an intellectual, when no one around cared about his or her intellectual needs – although the person might be well taken care of both financially and administratively. As mentioned by M(B), ‘There was no one around to guide me through all that quagmire’. The person might also produce an impression that he or she was having a good career. The same M(B) confesses, ‘On that empty job I was promoted very fast with the standing ovation’, or ‘Participating in all those stupid activities, I was never short of cash’. However, the non-placement feeling was associated with how the person evaluated his own intellectual growth and therefore, related to his self-assessment and satisfaction with his own life, as affected by his career development.

All the informants experienced a sense of non-placement in their Soviet academic lives. Some of them had that feeling more than once, during various stages of their careers. The non-placement feeling can be associated with a ‘quagmire’, ‘empty space’, something amorphous, the state of ‘suffocation’, a ‘disgusting and loathsome place’, or ‘darkness’. The informants find it hard to precisely describe their daily routine in such places because the latter evoke very vague, amorphous, memories. The respondents tried to escape from their non-places as soon as possible:

M(B): What I was doing there? Now *I don't remember precisely*. But what I remember crystal clear is we, researchers, had been cracking bricks for a long time, in order to build the second floor.

F(Z): It was an *empty* space in my career. Having worked there for two years, I got a 2-year maternity leave.

M(B): Those four years were *absolutely littered, absolutely criss-crossed* out of my life.

M(E): ...a *neither-flesh-nor-bone* period...

M(Y): As if were walking through the dark forest...

F(X): I was *suffocating* in that cultural space! Every day I felt an ominous loop tightening around my neck.

M(B) describes his feeling of non-placement as that of being kept in a golden cage, ‘Via the pull of my friend, I was designated to work at the SAS Institute of

Radio-technical Equipment and Electronics. I was *imprisoned* in that *sharashka* for four years. Absolutely worthless! Absolutely loathsome!’

The Soviet academic non-placement feeling could be aroused during various career stages and under various conditions. F(Z) felt non-placed at her first work place. Before entering the academic profession, she had worked for two years as a secondary school teacher of history. F(D) and F(Y) started to feel non-placed after having been exiled from their academic Edens. For example, F(D) was employed at a very peripheral University, with ‘a very low academic culture’, after having received her under-graduate and graduate education at a prestigious Soviet University in Kazan. F(Y)’s non-placement feeling was initiated by her transfer to a relatively peripheral laboratory, preceded by her placement at the MSU and the Bauman Institute:

F(Y): After graduation from the MechMat-MSU I started work at the Bauman Highest Technical Institution... But then I quit that fantastic job for some time because I could not cope with the teaching load since I had two little kids. Some time later I came back to work yet at another place, the lab at the Institute of Statistics. Sloppy work...I don’t understand what for! Neither did anyone in our team. Let it be an unexplainable phenomenon of the Soviet regime. It was so boring. I escaped from there to the post-graduate school.

Another condition for feeling non-placed, as described by M(H) and F(X), was the absence of geographical mobility. Thus F(X) says, ‘In the USSR I always felt the ominous impossibility to travel anywhere. That immobility was suffocating’.

In the opinion of M(H), the usual working routine, if it lasts for a long time, may eventually cause ‘a feeling of intellectual captivity’. He confesses:

Having worked in the FIAN for twenty-eight years, I started to feel trapped and handcuffed. It was like a lethal cobweb. I felt that I was stagnating. I felt bound all over my body. I felt bound with various connections, clan obligations and communication with the same people every day. Such a quagmire is very detrimental for a scholar. The only thing I wanted was to get away from my common routine and obligations.

The length of non-placement may differ. F(Z) and M(B) felt non-placed for two and four years, whereas F(Y) and her husband F(Y) think they repeatedly had

that feeling throughout their career, though the career of the latter has been marked with very bright spots:

F(Y): You know what kind of impression I had had of my career by the advent of perestroika? Not only my career but also my whole life had made me feel old and discarded. Though I was only 40, my life perception was that of an old woman, who has not perspective, no stimulus to live further, I had a feeling that not only myself but also my children had no future and that everything my husband and I were doing was swimming against the wild currents in an effort to give education to our children and to bring them up.

M(Y): We are the betrayed and deceived generation. We were morally dumped by the Communist Party when Brezhnev came to power. I do not remember the exact day of the Brezhnev's reign advent. I cannot say when exactly it started. But I can say our lives changed. It was a monstrous time in terms of morale. Everything was regressing. The whole life was an eternal regression. People around were being turned into pigs, drunk, mean and lowered down. Since the time the 1960s were "buried", all other generations, including my children, have grown up in a state of despair. No one believed in anything. People had no zest in life. Neither did they know how to get it. Everything was so bleak and nonchalant. Still everyone kept murmuring the well rehearsed and learnt by heart anthems about communism. Everything was soaked through with lies.

The long-term impact of academic non-placement has been summarised by M(B), who confesses, 'I still have knowledge gaps'.

The informants pinpoint two basic strategies of coping with the non-placement feel: delving into science and changing the environment:

M(Y): Because it was a stupid job... I could spend a lot of time on studying maths for my own purposes. I had written many articles during those five years...I never stopped researching in maths. That was everything for me: my little world; my mathematics; only my territory, where I was hiding, escaping from reality.

M(H): While in Moscow, I felt that I had to flee somewhere. I even thought of applying for work to Gor'ky [a peripheral Russian town]. I thought, 'Let it be the periphery and a lower position. I only want to be on the move and to reanimate my brains

because I need some fresh air'. I was eager to work in another environment, in another team and with other people [He speaks very emotionally. He is very excited].

A specific kind of academic non-placement can be an *academic airport* – the phenomenon observed in the cases of M(X) and M(Z). It is an academic affiliation considered by the informants as a temporary stoppage before the future bigger promotion. Though very unpleasant, the academic airport may be quite well tolerated by an academic person if he knows that a much better chance is definitely ahead. In this case the academic airport prevents an academic from unnecessary long-term contracts and obligations and acts out as an academic '*place-en-route*', without extremely painful associations. The person may not experience any negative emotions about this non-place because there are initially no expectations related to this place.⁵⁷ It is like an academic *depot*:

M(X): Since my undergraduate years, I had been dreaming of working at the Landau Institute together with my advisor. But at the time of my graduation they had no vacancy and my advisor arranged my employment at another SAS institution. It was not a bad place at all but I could do what I wanted to do there because I had totally different research interests. However, I was not disheartened at all because I knew it was temporary. My advisor told me to wait a little for the vacancy at Landau. So that institution was not my cup of tea but I was OK, waiting for my transfer to Landau. When you have grand goals in mind, it is very important to learn to wait. Patience is rewarded.

M(Z): I found a job at a peripheral research institution. In terms of intellectual growth, it was a nonchalant period in my life. But I knew I would not get stuck there because I was searching for a post-doctoral position abroad.

In the case of F(Q), however, the process of waiting had eventually the adverse effect of disillusionment on her. After graduation she failed to get into a particular

⁵⁷ For general information on *places-en-route*, see Weinrod and Levy (2005: 23). They look at the place-en-route as a place 'infused with...symbolic features of both home and away'. A place-en-route is a place where a person feels lost and estranged from others because this is not where he feels at home. However, he may feel quite confident about this place because he knows that he is on the right road toward finding a better place – the academic home, in my case.

academic institution in the Russian Academy of Sciences [RAS], which had been always a tempting professional destination for her. That is why she 'had nothing else to do than to enter the Institute of Molecular Biology', a much less desired option. Promised a job at the institution of her first choice, she 'agreed to wait a little'. But when the desired place offered her a position half a year later, she refused to transfer because by that time she saw no meaning in it thinking, 'All RAS places are the same. I had been *deeply bogged in* already. Something inside me had become sort of *moribund*'. As we can see, F(Q)'s academic airport finally turned into an academic quagmire for her. An interesting question can be posted for future analysis: *When* does an academic airport turn into an academic quagmire, in which a person sinks under the force of such factors as marriage and children (the cases of F(Y) and M(E)'s wife) or lack of entrepreneurial skill (M(E)'s case)? *When precisely* does it happen and what other factors contribute to this metamorphosis?

Speaking about their non-places, in general, and particularly about academic depots, which eventually led to permanent and desired positions either in the USSR or in emigration, the informants acknowledge the following. Firstly, academic non-placement is an unavoidable attribute of academic career: the majority of academics experience non-placement and sometimes more than once throughout their careers. Secondly, the non-placement feeling may be aroused at any career stage and under various circumstances. Thirdly, academic depots become an essential feature of the trans-national career, especially during the early post-emigration stage – when a person goes through a variety of temporary jobs and the unstable nature of these jobs or short-term contracts causes a feeling of discomfort and uncertainty if compared with the previous Soviet life-long employment:

F(Z): Until I found a permanent job here, I had been feeling very uneasy in the UK. Different workplaces, short-term contracts and variable research topics were very stressful for me. Locked up inside that kaleidoscope, I felt very keyed up. I found it very uncomfortable to be on temporary positions after my permanent Moscow job.

F(X): This uncertainty in tomorrow started from the very beginning, when I was told at Princeford that in eight years my contract would terminate yet it could be stopped any year, and goes on until now.

Summing up the negative memories of the Soviet academic nation in exile - they are mostly related to the Soviet period - however, may also touch upon their Western experiences. If we consider career development as a professional journey, each occupation probably has particular associations with non-placement. Academic non-placement is related to anti-intellectualism, the latter frequently described by researchers. There are different types of academic non-placement: empty spaces (neither here nor there), academic airports (which are sometimes associated with a high degree of anxiety) and loathsome places. What makes a particular workplace feel like a non-place – that is, to look loathsome or empty? This feeling is aroused by particular people who surround an academic or by a particular working environment. Sartre (1956) says, ‘Hell is when you are deadlocked together with the people you abhor’. The nature of reminiscences themselves at the moment of such a placement can also impact upon perception. According to La Rochefoucauld (1993), ‘There is no greater suffering than to remember the days of happiness at the moment of despair’. This feeling often arose in my informants during the phase of their exile from academic paradise.

Academic tribalism

As already mentioned, the informant’s negative memories depict the intrusion of the communist party into their academic lives. In more specific terms, however, the career obstruction was associated with tribal, that is, inter-collegiate, relations within a department and sometimes within an institution, as officially representing the communist regime. The informants particularly stress the negative impact of administrators or tribal leaders upon their progression. As observed by the informants, the communist ideology was often used as a cover for academic tribalism, aiming at humiliation and elimination of outstanding academics.

The oligarchy of the communist party was what the academic leadership in the Soviet Russia was associated with. As mentioned by M(G), ‘*Partkom* [the local committee of the communist party] was the head of the academic house’. All informants acknowledge that the ‘Emperor’ (as defined by M(E)), that is, the communist regime was represented by specific persons (such as dean, department head, or principal) who had the privilege of exercising unlimited power. Though the

party's politics was perceived by the respondents as obscure and nonsensical, it was specifically monitored by concrete people holding CPSU membership and even KGB affiliation and revealing the professional identities of a 'feud', 'little king', 'Stalinist', or 'academic *cosa nostra*'.

F(X): In 1967 through the 1970s the two mighty persons, the dean and the head of the foreign literature department, monitored all that communist politics at our faculty – the place that was an absolute retrograde... Everything, absolutely everything, was in his hands. The opinion of a professor with the world known name meant NOTHING to him. It was our DEAN...*the feudal owner!*

F(W): In Russia I had a very Stalinist head of the department in the early 1980s. She was only in her early thirties and I keep wondering where she got all that Stalinist cruelty.

F(X): Our department head was at the rank of *KGB Major*, an officer under cover...She was like a *little king*, to whom all 29 department members kowtowed.

The informants also stress the involvement of their bosses in the communist criminalization activities such as professional fraud, leading to personal wealth; the official, that is, state authorised, stealing of intellectual property; and the godfather's cruelty toward ordinary employees:

M(G): I was the pioneer in solving that task, which was known as the Poincare' puzzle...However, the official award was given to the secretary of our communist party committee.

M(E): In my opinion, that man had everything: cars, flats, clients, work orders and a good profit. And when I came across that blank refusal to understand my situation, I was both shocked and deeply hurt by his cruel response...[He laughs sadly and coughs.]

The informants confess that the feudal power was undefeated (as protected by the Soviet ideology), fearsome and leading to tribal conflicts:

M(E): It was the savage slavery when the employer decided to grab his slave's findings. And the slave could not even object. Even if he did, the conflict acquired very ugly configurations.

The monologues below of F(Q) and M(S) describe those Soviet conflicts in detail and point to the fact of administrative fraud and the violation of professional ethics. In the opinion of F(Q), such conflicts created unhealthy conditions for academic work.

F(Q): The deputy head was a nasty virago, a disgusting termagant, a dirty scold. She simply set the goals to live people out and succeeded in it by creating unbearable working conditions. The most frequent exodus was street-like clashes and swearing in four-letter items. It is disgusting even to think that all this really happened to me. All this was nasty, nasty, nasty.... But at the festive table (which is a tradition in many Russian work places) she was as meek as a lamb, as if nothing had happened...She created such conditions that were unacceptable for biological experiments (we do depend on minerals for our productivity) and demanded correct results. She stole, swiped and spent the money on repair works in her office. She managed to refurbish a separate office for herself on the experimental money. And in between the repair works she lived the people out. Very few guys withstood. I did not quit because of my panache. She gave us the dissolution liquid in quantities lesser than necessary. And doing this she said that everything had been measured properly...and always lied, lied, lied... And it was so all the time. And you could prove anything. If we all came to the consensus and decided to write an official complaint on her...But no one wanted trouble...The main factor is this kind of working atmosphere...When you see how you have been constantly deceived! Of course, you can ignore it as a fact and pretend that you don't see it. But when the situation goes too far and you cannot pretend anymore! And you cannot prove anything: she will simply say that she occasionally made a mistake. But this occasion lasts forever! I don't understand how she could enjoy moving out people from their jobs in between her repair works! Intercollegiate relations, all those squabbles. It is impossible to make a discovery when you work like this!

M(S): That was so dirty. Once I told him that the distribution of teaching hours should be done through the agreement between administrators only and not through individual teachers' plea. He started blackmailing me. He said that he was going to write to our Moscow administration that I was "sabotaging the working process". And all this was happening still under the Soviet Union. He invented such labels for which people had been shot had he lived a little earlier.

The unlimited power often led to anti-intellectualism and academic non-placement, as described earlier. For example, one of M(Y)'s bosses was a talented scholar who, spoiled by that absolute power, finally underwent the metamorphosis toward anti-intellectualism:

Job-hunting in Moscow, I came across a man who was affiliated to the Research Institute of Organic Chemicals, NIOPIK [the Russian abbreviation]. They were designing paste for pens. That man was a talented chemist and an amateur mathematician. Loving maths like mad, he had no mathematical education. Of course, he knew several basic things about mathematics that are adjacent to chemistry but that knowledge was not enough to involve him in serious mathematical research. Still he was obsessed with a mathematical equation. Without a mathematical background, he had been trying to solve a specific type of equation – the differential equation with digressing argument. It is a very specific type of equation in mathematics. I have absolutely no clue why he wanted to solve exactly that type of equation. He believed that the solution of that equation would explain any mystery of the whole universe. I was hired as his personal mathematician. Having power and money, he could afford such an intellectual toy. Theoretically, I was a Senior Research Fellow at NIOPIK whereas my actual duties were to consult him in maths and develop his sand castle initiative of solving that equation. I had worked five years like this. Of course, it was senile to discuss mathematical issues with him. He asked me to forecast and to fancy various solutions of that equation – the solutions that could not exist.

Analysing academic power, the informants recognise the academic hierarchy, with its implicit laws of promotion. Those laws included the establishment of academic gates and queues, both used for eliminating or slowing down outsiders and opponents. As F(W) shows, the main factor impeding academic promotion was access to information and that access was obstructed by the behind-the-curtain culture of academic vassalage. The main purpose of academic queues was to place a particular person as far as possible from the necessary information. So in order to approach the information, the person had to deserve a better position in line through kowtowing to the queue builder – that is, the administrator. Because the Soviet PG entrance was based on negotiations rather than on open competition

(as mentioned earlier), such intra-departmental queues could also slowdown postgraduate progression:

M(E): Academic gate-keeping...If some people have already passed through those gates and if now they also want their clan members to pass through those doors, of course, such people try to slow you down. They try not to let *you* through those gates. They slow you down because you are a potential competitor.

F(W): Our department head had a circle of favourite people and a circle of outcasts. That division was very evident. There is a sort of behind-the-curtain-talk culture and impeded access to information. She called some people very warmly by first name whereas she addressed the others in a very cold and military-like manner by surname. Of course, she was keen on promoting a sort of hierarchy. She kept slowing down some people while she deliberately promoted the elected others and allowed them to enter the postgraduate programme much earlier.

M(X): In the Soviet mathematical school, particularly represented by the SAS, there was always a school leader under whose guidance the rest of the personnel were losing their independence. The leader could always slow down their individual growth. I wish we had had no leaders in those days!

M(E) has his own approach to passing through the tribal gates – the approach he himself has never used and therefore, has never passed through them:

M(E): In order to pass through such gates, you yourself must become an academic duke. No other way. You should shape your own tribe, in which you should become the local duke. An academic career here is a game. If you accept its rules, you will become a success. It is impossible to change the system.

F(W) recalls that another way through such gates could be to kowtow – the way that was popular in her department. In the opinion of the informants, survival in a tribe was a matter of political gamesmanship. The challenge was that the rules of that game violated the informants' honour codes. Thus F(W), M(E) and M(S) acknowledge that they 'were not cut out for' adjusting to or mastering such methods of survival:

F(W): Never holding membership in my boss' closest circle, I could not step over myself to do it. Neither did I actually know how such things were done.

M(E): I can't be a duke – I just can't. It is not in my blood.

M(S): What kind of leader could I be? If I had become an administrator, I would have had to quarrel with people and to hurt them. Otherwise, the administrative process was not possible. It is not my cup of tea. I just hate all this. It is much better to remain a scholar – when you don't have to hurt anyone.

One of the people who adjusted to the system, according to M(E)'s advice, and therefore, passed through those gates is M(H). He confesses:

I was hurt many times. But this is life. There is no other way. Leadership always involves very tough relations. Then I myself became a group leader in a SAS institution and I was quite crude with my employees. Of course, it was the perfectionist cruelty – still I was a hard man to disagree with. And those who disagreed with me had to quit. Otherwise it would be impossible to work. There should be only one captain aboard. This is the scientific life.

The existence of such gates led my informants to think about the Soviet academic bureaucracy and hierarchy in terms of their impact upon academic identities. And here they clearly see the clash 'leaders versus scholars'. Comparing scholars and administrators, the informants acknowledge that the latter category had appropriate education, at least, formally. Coming back to the question of motivation for academic career, M(Y) and F(Y) distinguish between true scholars, who are keen on science, and administrators, who do not love science. The informants believe that true science and power are largely incompatible because the latter is destructive for the former. That is why M(S) was reluctant to join the communist party though he knew that the CPSU membership would be beneficial for his career. He says, 'I am a scholar – not a toady'. F(Y) remarks that when a scientist switches to administration, he or she ceases to be a true scholar because 'science demands all of you and does not forgive the betrayal'. She describes Soviet administrators as 'initially trained', however, becoming 'unskilled' in the course of their scientific careers and

developing goals other than research and teaching. She and M(E) observe that the worst administrator is the one who is totally incompetent in science:

M(Y): I cannot say that they were uneducated because their formal education was OK. Those were people who did not love scientific research.

F(Y): I think that mathematicians who wanted to study mathematics became researchers or teachers whereas those who did not want to deal with science but was keen on money and power became University administrators.

M(Y): I would call them academic idiots, because only idiots can choose administration over science.

F(Y): I would say that those were incompetent people, who either got to the top management or were "serving" the top management. For example, there was an initiative of information technology literacy for all staff members in the University. The department head was giving an introductory lecture. For 2 hours he was demonstrating a very simple operation. It was nonsense! What he did next was just ridiculous :) He asked me to come up to the blackboard and said, 'She will finish the lecture because I am so tired and I have to go home. My wife is waiting for me'. Can you imagine that?

M(E): This academic bureaucracy, this academic administration, is actually represented by other scholars, who are a little bit higher on the social ladder than you are at the moment. Scientific bureaucrats are the same scientists, who, having taken certain positions, are pursuing their goals through their position effect.

F(Y): There is actually no harm from competent teachers or true scientists. These are very good people to get along with whereas when someone wants to win some prestige among the top management he is ready for everything.

M(Y): Well, those people were mostly communist party members...

F(X): ...who made their careers only because of the party membership or loyalty.

M(E): And once they find themselves higher on the social ladder, they want even more than they have: they want to be the Head of School or the Head of the Department.

F(Y): Having reached the top of the career ladder, they started to dictate their conditions to researchers and teachers.

Analysing the administrator-scholar relations, M(E) also points to the category of the Soviet scholar-perfectionist who became an administrator – like the earlier mentioned M(H). This administrative category is different from what has been described by F(Y), M(Y) and M(S). In the opinion of M(E), those people remained very professional and prolific throughout their careers, though often turning into the ‘academic cosa nostra’. And their administrative cruelty emerged as a side effect of the scholarly ascetism:

M(E): You know, in general, the world of science is very cruel. In the Soviet science there was a sort of implicit career scheme, based on the age deadlines. If a scientist had not defended his PhD by the age of thirty, he was said to be an academic misfit. If a scientist had not defended the Dr.Sc. at a prestigious place by the age of forty-five, that wasn’t very good either. Soviet scientists were under constant pressure of those *de facto* age requirements. No wonder most of those who had survived that pressure turned into academic sharks, sometimes devouring everything and everyone around. Most research supervisors were very harsh people.

These tribal relations within Soviet academia were foremost associated for my informants with public humiliation. In many cases, the humiliation aroused within the intra-departmental relations and was associated with being placed in a queue for a favour of promotion. According to F(W), the humiliation conveyed the person’s voluntary, yet by default, involvement in sort of a departmental game, the rules of which issued a challenge to the honour code:

F(W): Our department head established a queuing order system, according to which we were to line up for everything, for every slightest promotion. The most humiliating about that queue was the necessity of dancing on your tiptoes and serving her, in order to get your turn.

M(Y): Straight from the SAS, I came to teach at the Evening Pedagogical Institute. That institute was something like a community college. It offered only evening classes for mature students. The atmosphere there was – I don’t even know a decent word to put it. I still find disgusting to recall that. There I suffered a lot from the power of rogues. There were some decent mathematicians in that organization. Still all of them

were at the beck and call of those rogues, who were governing everything.

F(X) describes academic humiliation as the process of kowtowing to the department head and as the reflection of the overall societal culture that was of the pro-Soviet nature – the culture of ‘lumpen-peasants’ and ‘lumpen-proletaria’: ‘The Soviet context of our typically pro-Soviet department, with all those stupid peasant-like women...The only thing the latter did was kowtowing to the department head’.

As observed by F(Y), a typical reason for tribal conflicts was administrative fraud around the distribution of working hours or the teaching load. She also accentuates the routine and ‘atrociousness’ of this academic tribalism, the latter causing a health hazard in the very direct meaning of the word:

Some people were very keen on making dreadful things to each other. For example, I got the teaching load of 30 h/w, which was madness. After that one of my older colleagues told me, ‘Oh, dear, you will break down in a couple of months! You will not hold it for a long time!’ So it happened: I began feeling sick. The department head did not know what to do with those 30 h/w because he could not find anyone who would like to substitute for me. As a result, he organised a meeting at which the department was to discuss my unacceptable behaviour, the fact of my illness. Because the secretary of the CPSU (communist party) committee was a decent guy, he said, ‘Let’s count how many hours she has already completed’. They discovered that my yearly workload had already been 1.5 over, which automatically cancelled the legitimacy of the question. I was freed from all classes except one group. The next day our department head was behaving as if nothing had happened, as if they hadn’t thrown all that mud at me. My file was simply buried, whereas before that he and some other people had kept saying that I was doing nothing.

As observed by M(Y) and F(Y), the humiliation was a manifestation of administrative power, which was unpredictable, and those who underwent or witnessed it were left helpless:

M(Y): Those communist party meetings...That was quite a phenomenon of dementia. I was never a communist. However, if I failed to attend such a meeting, there was a huge storm. That is why I had to attend those meetings and listen to all that nonsense and see the humiliation of decent people. That was horrible, especially the feeling of helplessness

because you knew you could not defend a good person without consequences. I wish I could say that I responded. I wish I could. I cannot forget the episode about our department head at one of such meetings. Our department head was a good mathematician and a nice person, though a little broken down. Once during such a meeting for the whole University (there were lots of people there) the principal, one of the KGB men, was listening to reports by all departments. That was a regular empty talk, as usual; all those windbags with their pompous speeches. Everyone got bored. Suddenly our principal decided to break that boredom and to display his power. While our department head was reporting, the principal interrupted him and said in public, 'Stop pulling my leg with fairy-tales about your departmental achievements! You are no one without my support! I can put you on one of my palms and squash with the other! It is only up to me to decide whether you will be bogged down or raised!' That was so disgusting. Can you imagine that our department head, who was an administrator and a respectable professor, was forced to listen to all that verbal mud with the mute patience of a dog, in the presence of everyone, including his employees [he speaks with anger]. It was not surprising that after that a sober person would leave the country as soon as he had such a chance. That was the Soviet power, naked and evident. How should I name it? Can there be a precise name for this? It was the Soviet power in action.

F(Y): My colleague, a very talented mathematician, had a personal invitation for the World Mathematical Congress to make an hour presentation at the plenary session. Such a rarity! However, he needed the departmental recommendation in order to go there[^]. Isn't it nonsense? Can you guess what our department head said at the departmental meeting? He said, 'We shall think whom to send there. We shall send only the most talented person and it may not be you!'

Another administrative strategy in the promotion of Soviet academic tribalism was the elimination of outcasts. That process was often delivered under the cover of communist ideology, certain elements of which strongly supported the accomplishment of the disposal. For example, academic people were, in many cases, stamped out as not matching the requirements of the communist party or of the Soviet membership. That process penetrated into many domains of academic life, including PG entrance and in-service staff promotion:

F(X): When the administration, the Dean, didn't want someone to get to the postgraduate school, that undesirable person was peppered with irrelevant questions during the exam on the History of the Communist Party, with the final knock down

M(G): The Steklov Institute of Mathematics at the Russian Academy of Sciences, known as '*Steklovka*', was noted for its academic feudalism and vandalism. Once my friend was employed there. Having received a very prestigious SAS award for the best research of the year, the next year he was kicked out of *Steklovka* on the grounds of incompetence. The thing was that the person who was going to become principal became envious of my friend, thought him a serious rival and started to spin intrigues. And that's it. Finally that academic manoeuvre master managed to set the University Council to vote against my friend. Nobody could prove anything. All that was happening behind the closed doors. As for my friend's students, they were scared to death.

As observed by M(Y), the elimination process was gathering its highest momentum under Brezhnev – the time marked with a great number of academic outcasts or victims of academic tribalism:

The more talented the scholar, the more people punched him. If you had bright ideas, you became an outcast, a black sheep in the "Soviet family". Mr.β used to have many enemies because he was a very good teacher. He was accused of breaking the Soviet morale and ideologically executed at the communist party meeting. To blame a talented academic person for the moral impurity was a very common phenomenon in the Brezhnev's epoch. Mr.β was not the only victim of Brezhnevism.

'Mr. β was not the only martyr', adds M(S), 'but he was definitely out of tribe...put nowhere'. As I have already mentioned, all the informants came across academic non-placement. M(B) describes this phenomenon in tribal terms - as being out of tribe. In 1989-1990 he was gainfully employed and 'generally taken care of'. However, he views his position in that particular tribe as affiliation with the 'wrong people' – with people who did not contribute to his intellectual progression. And the knowledge accumulation is what the informants were always seeking in intra-tribal liaisons. His monologue below shows that the wrong placement was diagnosed by him only in retrospect and that it actually meant the informational blockade. In fact,

even within that tribe there were some possibilities of healthy professional contacts. However, it was the informational stoppage that made those relations invisible and therefore, non-existing, as illustrated below by M(B)'s case:

My employer was a very hyperactive citizen. He was not only a communist but also a KGB man. But in those days I did not see it or maybe preferred to keep my eyes shut. As Senior Research Fellow, he had sought to recruit a research group of younger kindred spirits from his own faculty. Thus in his group there were four of us, immature kids, absolutely inexperienced in the ways of the world. The problem was that none of us understood which scientific domain to plunge oneself into. That is why nothing made sense and everything was run in a sort of imbecile manner. This is the crux of the matter: there were no requirements at all and no one expected us to do anything!!! That's it! All that was completely sequestered from I now call healthy and normal science. The overall culture of the people I was socializing with in those days was not really high. The major employee body there did absolutely nothing. Again looking back on it, I understand that there were several decent people. But as a college graduate, I could not figure out who was who. Unfortunately, I was not destined *in those days* to get in touch with people who were doing healthy, high quality, science at our institute. There were not many of them and I simply passed by them because I was so ignorant. I realised who they were only after they had left the country. But when they were in Russia, they were not on my playground. There was no one who could tell me, 'Don't go there! Go here!'

As a final note on the Soviet academic tribalism, it was widespread mostly by means of two major administrative techniques – the strategies that made those structures highly powerful. The Soviet academic tribalism was based on communist ideology, against which nobody would dare to act, and impeded access to information. The latter was possible due to the totalitarian, closed, nature of the state.

Soviet anti-Semitism

In addition to all these totalitarian memoirs, the most painful memories for my Jewish informants were those about their confrontation with anti-Semitism in 1967-1985 and its effects on their careers. They recall the anti-Semitic system of higher education through the following discriminatory episodes: (1) banning their University entrance; (2) banning entrance to the academic profession; (3) promotional barriers; and (4) fraudulent firing. The following stories illustrates the first case:

F(Y): There was a selection: on the entrance exams they [Jewish applicants] were isolated in a separate group. It was a high risk group because the examination requirements for them were much higher than those for the rest of the applicants. Those requirements allowed examiners to unfairly low applicants' grades.

F(E): In 1984 I was rejected on the entrance exam while applying to the MechMat [the Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics at the Moscow State University]. Next year my folks supported me to apply to another school – the Institute of Oil and Gas, known as the “*kerosinka*”⁵⁸. I did so and finally got there because the *kerosinka* was the right place for Jews...Why was it called *kerosinka*? I don't know [She makes a pause and starts coughing nervously]...Yes, very weird, stupid associations [she coughs and chuckles nervously]...wartime humour! [She laughs nervously].

As the interviews indicate, the admission quotas' resulted in a large-scale loss of capable people. M(X) says, 'Think about the fact that many people did not get to the University, did not graduate from it and did not become mathematicians. They could have become very good mathematicians. It was damaging society. The science, undoubtedly, has lost many bright minds'. Secondly, this process (and Beck (1992) would probably call it 'risk modernization') made everyone equal under the risk of quota – both ordinary Jewish people from the street and children of the Jewish intellectual elite. The latter intellectuals were not safe from the quota because of the inter-tribal tensions in the Soviet Russian academy. Below is how F(Y), a victim's mother and another victim's friend, answers my question, 'How did those people [the 'rejects'] manage to enter the University?'

F(Y): Some did, if they were really capable. Knowledge is power and maths is above politics [she laughs nervously]. Of course, the assignments were extra-hard. The kids were peppered with extra questions, especially on the oral exam. Some of them actually passed. But there were so few of those lucky people. Some capable kids did not apply to the MechMat from the very beginning. My husband's advisor and our close friend was Swedish but everyone thought him Jewish because of his equivocal surname. His son decided not to apply to the

⁵⁸ *Kerosinka* (Russian) is a nickname for the kerosene stove, a highly popular in the Soviet Union camp-stove that utilizes kerosene (a specific type of gas oil), and also a nickname for the Institute of Oil and Gas in Moscow.

MechMat because the father himself was sure that the kid would not get there. The guy received higher education in applied mathematics at the “stove”, which was very friendly to Jews [she chuckles nervously] though his father had been a reputable academician at the MechMat!!!

M(Z): I was lucky not to have been knocked out at the entrance college exams. Prior to them I had attended the preparatory classes. That programme was organised by Jewish rights advocates particularly for Jews with the purpose of explaining to them and coaching them in how to approach the elimination entrance tasks...Of course, different places had different states of things. Some Universities accepted all applicants on equal terms and on the basis of merit only. Others allowed far from everyone...The majority of my friends purposefully targeted places where the admission was through honest competition only.

As seen from these responses, Jewish students in elite schools were an exception rather than the rule. Their early career progression was a matter of luck, whose nature is obscure even to the informants themselves. Yet even for that lucky minority the ominous quota started to work out in devastating fashion as early as at the time of graduation. The recruitment ban can be illustrated by M(Z)’s story:

When I was graduating from the Moscow State University, the Dean’s office could not find a workplace for me. They did not know any place where I could be wanted because of my ethnicity. In most cases, we were assigned either to a “box” [a military research institution] or to a postgraduate school. In order to get into the Academy of Sciences, one must have a personal request. There was no honest competition. Everything was arranged from mutual agreement. I referred to various friends for help. Yet no postgraduate school and no lab wanted me as a student or as an employee... My vain endeavours to get to the postgraduate programme...They told me that to accept me to the postgraduate school was contradictory to the Party policy...In the Soviet Union they always made it clear what your ethnicity was. I was face-to-face interviewed by the Vice Principal of the Institute of Problem-Based Mechanics, a prospective place of my postgraduate affiliation. Then he had a talk with the Head of the First Department [the KGB] and the latter said no. A famous professor and the vice principal were pro me. But the Principal and the Head of the First Department said no and closed the question. I remember that miserable expression on their faces, the eyes turned aside and all that behind-the-curtain whispering. Everyone knew that there might be problems because of my ethnicity. [He speaks very nervously and

quickly and avoids the word “Jew”]....Finally I managed to get into a fly-by-night office.

As is evident, for Soviet Russian Jews interested in the academic profession, access was blocked either directly, through faculty non-recruitment, or indirectly, thoroughly rejected applications for post-graduate studies. Most such victims experienced both of these practices, either occurring simultaneously or with the denial of job applications followed by PGS entrance rejection.

Another form of discrimination, ‘fraudulent firing’, was the most painful intellectual torture for Jewish academics and their significant others. In simple terms it existed as rough firing, followed by insinuations of ‘show trials’. Below is how M(X) recalls this practice. It happened to him in the late 1970s at the Soviet Academy of Sciences, now known as the Russian academy of Sciences or RAS.

M(X): Instead of promoting me to the Junior Researcher position, they accused me of stealing experimental equipment, which was a lie. Everyone knew I was an honest person and everyone kept sympathizing with me in private. However, the matter was likely to be taken into court and, though I knew that I would be eventually acquitted because there was no evidence against me, I decided to abandon that job on my own initiative because all that was so dirty.

F(Z): I have *very many friends* with identical life-stories.

M(X): It was always such a *banal scenario*...just a *dirty fake*.

As evident from these epiphanies, the respondents acknowledge that their Jewishness was the chief impetus for emigration. When I asked them to recall the most unpleasant or the most crucial episode in their lives, they spoke about their Jewish ethnicity. They also recognised its damage to their economic stability in the Soviet Union. Thus, F(X), the most ‘injured’ victim of academic anti-Semitism of my respondents, confesses:

I think had I not become the victim of anti-Semitism, my life could have taken quite a different turn. I totally admit that I wouldn’t have emigrated...My energy and intellectual capacity would have been enough for...eventually getting the Professor position...at the Moscow State University.

For my Jewish informants, the previously mentioned non-placement feeling was associated with their elimination on the grounds of their Jewish nationality. Thus they were exiled from their academic paradises to peripheral empty places only because they had fallen victims to those anti-Semitic campaigns. All my informants experienced the internal exile – that is, the exile within their totalitarian Soviet state. Most of them, predominantly Russians, found ways of breaking through that exile either through party membership or through specific intellectual niches such as mathematics and linguistics. Choosing those niches was part of their career planning, as I have already mentioned. For Jews it was an exile with no way out:

F(Z): Some say, 'Fight!' Others say, 'Reconcile yourself to your fate!' There are also parents who tell their children, 'Leave the country!' It is easy to say, 'Fight!' But how? This vile is undefeated. Reconciliation? As if it were possible! Shall one flee? But where? As if it were as easy as pie! What we actually have is Catch-22: there is no way out. There is actually no safe place to hide.

State-sponsored anti-Semitism in higher education largely contributed to the Jewish emigration from the late Soviet and early post-Soviet Russia, thus having made a huge input into the leukaemia of Russian science.

Perception of global academic work: West versus East

Having eventually emancipated themselves from Soviet anti-Semitism and other painful experiences, the Russian academic emigrants, however, find themselves now trapped in the difficulties of a different kind. Despite the absence of the Soviet academic gates, the informants clearly acknowledge the 'evils of academic capitalism' in the West – the challenges that did not exist back home. Comparing their Soviet and Western academic experiences and assessing their recent status, my informants refer to such aspects of academic work as the teaching/learning process; intercollegiate communication; and overall working conditions. Here I cannot say whether these reflections are positive or negative. However, they definitely contribute to the respondents' dynamic – 'open-textured' and 'combat' – thinking about who they are now in their exile. And such recollections show how complex the perception of academic life in global Universities may be for an immigrant.

Looking at the teaching and learning process in Western higher education, the informants remark that both their communication with students and the required style of instruction are very much formalised and bureaucratised, compared with those in the USSR. This lack of informal communication often leads to a sense of identity loss:

F(X): In the USSR it was a real student life, a wonderful life, with backpacking, camping holidays and the unbelievable delight of socialization. If you say something like this here to American students, you will have serious consequences whereas, as college students, we heard it all the time. It is not common here to call the student to the chalkboard, while in the Soviet Union we were called up to the board every day. Western students are happy people because their human rights are never trodden on.

The informants acknowledge that their communication with Western students is strictly formalised and limited by the rules of 'political correctness':

M(S): In the USA the strategy is the following: you should give the student the knowledge that he is able to and eager to get and you should also make the student feel happy as much as possible and do not let him feel humiliated.

In the opinion of M(S) and F(X), the major problem Russian academics face in the West is their inability to be politically correct with students:

M(S): It is totally unacceptable here to make spiteful remarks to students. I know many Russian teachers who have suffered for that.

F(X): At Princeford, I had a colleague among Soviet immigrants. And her major problem is her straightforwardness. Like many people from the Soviet Union, she is inflexible and zero-tolerant to everything that may vex her. She cannot follow the rules of the games, according to which Americans do not accept categorical judgements. A Russian person finds it very hard to understand. It often drives me nuts. I call it 'verbal semolina' or 'verbal mash'. For example, I want to say that this is a bad essay and that is a bad poem. For Americans it sounds too categorical. They would prefer to say that this essay stands a little aside from being brilliant or that the poem is not one of the masterpieces. Very dodgy!

The respondents recognise an entirely different teaching format, oriented toward the student who is a client in the West (M(S) and M(Y)), which makes the teaching process extremely difficult for a Russian academic. The difficulty is around serving a student rather than forcing him to learn:

M(G): Teaching here [in the USA] is much more responsible. Here students pay for their education. And since they pay, they demand attention. An American student wants to get your feedback for his investments. Therefore, he demands that the whole teaching process should look as if it had just stepped out of a bandbox. For example, all mathematical assignments must be neatly printed out, with the following answers. An American student wants to master the subject and wants to do it in the best conditions. All this is so time consuming! All those quizzes, tests and home assignments are so burdensome! Moreover, you must grade them by a certain deadline!

The interviewees also observe that the absence of totalitarianism, with its inexorable humiliation, reduces the educational outcomes among western undergraduates:

M(E): I don't like the educational system here at all. The teaching process here is not effective in terms of educational outcomes.

M(G): Even Mr.β himself, who arrived here, in the USA, more than twenty years ago, is constantly complaining that he does not have brilliant students here.

In the opinion of M(S) and F(W), the most important thing for a travelling, displaced academic is 'to learn how to learn from the new environment'. Thus M(S) says that after his arrival in the USA, he immediately started to attend lectures by his much younger American colleague, in order 'to grasp the essentials of approaching students'. F(W) also mentions that such new conditions, regardless of how 'stressful their novelty can be', almost always refresh her mind 'like an ice-cold shower'. However, for some other people this adaptability may become a challenge of emigration and, particularly, of having to adapt to the 'highly bureaucratised intercollegiate relations'.

Intercollegiate communication in the West is associated for my informants with a substantial lack of informal peer support in specific, research-related, tasks and with a lack of informal friendship outside work.

F(X): I am indignant at the absurdity of the Princeford bureaucracy and the indifference of my colleagues. If it is not their business, they will not lift a finger in my defense. My American colleagues are remarkable people but I do not feel their souls. They are not my kindred spirits. This indifference is the most terrible in this huge, healthy, rational country!

M(E): My professional communication within my department [in the West] is limited by a very formal intercourse. I simply try to be polite because I cannot avoid being polite.

However, these conditions may vary, depending on the department. For example, M(B) and M(J) acknowledge that their professional socialization did not change at all because their major colleague body is comprised of Russian émigrés and they call themselves the '*Moscow-on-the-Mississippi*'. The same is observed by M(X), who says that his recent academic placement in Canada is 'amongst the same Russian scholars...like the *MechMat-on-the-Niagara*'.

On the other hand, the Western academic bureaucracy has undeniable advantages because it totally protects an academic from plagiarism or harassment and thus contributes to working conditions that are much 'healthier' than those in the USSR, as observed by F(Z):

It is very difficult to do science in Russia. Everything depends on informal connections. I am not very fond of the Russian attitude to work either. You always have to beg someone. These are very non-formal relations of mutual back-scratching. When you go to the computer service department you have to give them treatment for doing their job. Many people approach this with ease. But I prefer clarity. I feel very comfy at my British workplace, where I don't have to beseech anyone...Once I came across plagiarism in Russia and I think that it is a monstrous problem for Russia...An British scholar is safer from plagiarism. It will not be tolerated among British people.

Even the administrative control over the quality of instruction is delivered in a much gentler and less intrusive way. It is evident that in spite of missing certain elements of their Soviet academic culture, my informants are still very objective judges of all the benefits provided by globalization (including mobility, international contacts and better working conditions) when they think about their work in cross-cultural terms.

Thus comparing the working conditions in the Soviet Union with those in emigration, the informants acknowledge that the Western academy has the following distinguishing features: grants and short-term contracts - yet a solid material base of experimental equipment and international mobility.

All of them are exhausted by their 'lives on the road' (F(B)) and dependence 'on the grants' (M(Q)). This is how they correspondingly think about their 'long journeys toward the Western tenure' (M(X)), during which they invariably feel 'the sword of Damocles' related to the 'pressure of publications' (F(W)). Thus the respondents look at grants and short-term contracts as the evils of higher education globalization. These evils of academic capitalism are associated with the negative aspect of de-contextualisation of global academic work and its emotional instability (Altbach 2001; 2003).⁵⁹ The majority of my informants complain about the persistent physical tension, that is related to a huge working load in emigration:

F(X): At Princeford my working load has been tremendously huge, especially for the first time. It has always demanded from me an enormous amount of physical and emotional tension...Addressing my position at the department in administrative terms, all these 20 years have been awfully stressful. I constantly had to prove to everyone, from our programme director as my immediate boss to the Princeford top administration, that I could work till snowfall. I had to confirm that I was an eager beaver, who could work from dawn till dusk!

The uncertainty about the future, deriving from the complex bureaucratic procedures around tenure track, creates a feeling of discomfort and frustration in my respondents and facilitates their psychological alienation from the host culture.

F(X): I have received a thousand certificates. For the last five years, I haven't been assessed by students on the 'B' level even once...For almost two years [before the renewal of the eight-year preceptor contract at Princeford] I had been living a very stressful life. Just an incessant stress! I kept asking my boss what I had to do to make my case stronger. Still it was a life full of unimaginable stress and uncertainty in tomorrow.

⁵⁹ Using Beck's (2002) theory, we can call this phenomenon the *accumulation of emotional risk*. For more information on the 'risk'-approach in the analysis of the effects of globalization, see Beck (op cit).

In the opinion of M(Q), the problem with tenure track creates a Catch-22 for an academic:

The problem is that you should have a permanent job and a permanent salary, in order to apply for a grant. When a person is a permanent staff member, he can apply for grant at any time of the year. But I do not have a permanent position. I mean I cannot apply for a grant that will go beyond the limits of my working contract. For example, I can apply for a three-year grant right now. But in half a year I will not be able to do it anymore. This is the most lethal situation for me! In order to keep my haematological research group in a good working shape, I have to constantly develop my own expertise and I mustn't lose people. The latter is, unfortunately, unavoidable. I mean I can assume that I have absolutely nothing to do here and that I'd better search for another job. I mustn't stay here. I mean I must scan a job that would allow me to apply for grants. I don't want to say that the major problem is that I need a permanent job to support myself. The problem is that it is impossible to work productively without having a permanent job. As you see, there is a very short period of time when you can apply for a grant and after that period everything ceases to make sense.

Continuous grant applications and a pressure to publish destroy their work-life balance at the price of their family life and substantially add to their depression. Thus M(Q) and his wife – who is also a very prolific researcher in Sweden – divorced because their marriage did not survive through the distant relationship, or the 'astronaut circumstance', imposed on them by their academic 'maverick lives for the grants'. Luckily, the marriage of F(B) 'emerged through such hardships...though not without tension' before both she and her husband finally found permanent jobs in New York. M(H) is still separated from his wife, who is a PE academic in Moscow. He 'cannot afford to witness' his 'younger son's adolescence' and 'the bringing up of his granddaughter'.

M(X): When Russian people move to the West, they have to readjust themselves to the new requirements. And they scan different ways for such adjustment. Some academics increase the volume of articles, which are not always of the best quality. I have always tried to avoid it. First, I did not have many articles. But then...[he makes a pause and his voice breaks down]...I published some articles that shouldn't have been written at all.

As F(W) remarks, their 'life on the grants' is mostly associated with physical exhaustion and the necessity to choose between their family and professional roles:

F(W): In the USSR I was working twenty-two hours per week. These were the hours of classroom instruction, exclusively direct instruction. I cannot understand how I survived. Teaching only seven hours per week here, I feel busier and more stressful. The life there was calmer and steadier. Here I must work till sparks fly. This is why I decided not to have the second child. I feared for my career. [She nervously throws the mop from her forehead by a head movement, then puts a palm on her forehead and gives a heavy sigh. She is blushing.] You see how far all this is from my romantic past. If I did not have that damn glorious career, I would have given birth to the second baby. [Her voice is shrieking.]

Some informants come to the conclusion that the severe bureaucracy of the West imposes very strict obligations on them and thus substantially restricts their personal freedom:

M(X): I have a feeling that the freedom I had at Landau was never granted to me afterwards and that it will be never given to me again...I mean the freedom when I did not have to bother about money cheques and official paper work; when in Russia [he seems very agitated] you could withdraw from research for half a year and then come back as if nothing had happened. In the West you mustn't make a pause: you are always in state of race. This is not freedom anymore when you are on the highway and you cannot stop. This is an element of something that is far from freedom.

M(G): I don't have free time at all.

F(W): Of course, you can achieve a lot here without pulling, only due to your brains and diligence. Here one can succeed in many things and realise many projects. In this sense there is freedom here. But you must pay for this freedom and the price is rather high: either your career or your private life. I have almost completely refused to have a private life. My life is 90% my work. I don't have close friends any more. I daydream less and less. I have turned into a harder and more pragmatic person. I don't know if it is good or bad.

F(W) observes how much she has changed in emigration under the pressure of the Western educational market yet she evidently feels more powerful through this controversial metamorphosis:

The academic emigration has taught me discipline and self-organization. Here I have become a more disciplined person because here there are plenty written reports, file work and deadlines, which I did not have in Russia. Here there are very severe publication and conference attendance requirements. In Russia you could not publish at all. Of course, you could have had a couple of verbal offences because of that but no one would have killed you, literary speaking. Many people kept living exactly like this whereas here there is always someone with a cane who constantly demands that you should publish more books and articles. You always feel this cane. You always feel a dagger at your heart. And you should stay tense and alert. Otherwise you will be eliminated from this system.

On the other hand, the informants, particularly, physicists and molecular biologists, acknowledge the excellent equipment for setting experiments – the material base that was missing in the early post-modern Russia. For this category of scholar (and such people prevail in my research), the Western experimental equipment means an extremely high degree of productivity and therefore, intellectualism. Another advantage of academic exile is the possibility of academic mobility, associated with conference travels. My informants usually attend three or four international conferences per year and consider these trips ‘the most enjoyable part of the academic routine’. The contacts initiated at such conferences become pivotal in their career development. And these conferences enrich the intellectual experience of my informants and fully compensate for the lack of informal professional collaboration and thus resign them to their exile – which, in return, offers them some tangible benefits.

Evaluating the pros and cons of the Western academy, the informants stress the paramount importance of mobility and experimental equipment for their intellectual proliferation. M(E) remarks, ‘If it were possible to live in Russia like this: if the Russian people were combined with the American experimental base...’

Most of the interviewees confess that they emigrated because there was traditionally no mobility in the Soviet Union and also because the material base was rapidly deteriorating after the collapse:

M(Z): What made me emigrate? From the very beginning, I had no career progression in Russia and, I would say, I had no career as such again for the same reason [anti-Semitism]. Initially I did not manage to get into the right stream. That is why any

change was for the best. I had nothing to lose. In 1992 I was faced with the alternative of either to start earning money or to leave the country because by that time we had had nothing to live on. The years of 1989-1992 were a very critical period in my life. It was the period of economic hardships for me...Suddenly it became evident that there was nothing to live on after the Soviet economy had collapsed. So I think our emigration was economic rather than emancipation-driven...Though when all giants of our science started to emigrate, what sense did it make to stay? So I had nothing to lose.

M(G): After I realised that all grand scholars had left for the West, I myself decided to emigrate on the last train of socialism - it was 1995.

M(G): I left in order to remain a professional and, at the same time, in order to survive economically. To survive in Moscow and to feed the family of 3 children, I would have had to change my occupation and to do something I would have not been keen on. Whereas here I can plunge my mind into mathematics and earn honourable money. It was definitely an economic reason. At the same time, I am a patriot of my profession. I don't want to change it for business regardless of how profitable the latter is.

In other words, their impetus for emigration was their search for better academic conditions, in order to be prolific in the domain of their expertise. In this respect, the West has fully conformed to their chief expectations, in spite of the cross-cultural difficulties. Thus M(B) remarks, 'Here [in the USA] you can afford many different things. American salaries are much higher...Plus individualism in academic work...'

Here you may ask how this reconciliation with their own exile is possible at all after all these contradictions in their identities. It is not that they immediately forget about the evils of the academic capitalism when referring to its privileges. The issue is that, while recalling their negatives experiences in Russia and in the West, they prefer the conditions in which such experiences are less 'disturbing' or 'vexing'. Thus 'living on the road' is less destructive for their personalities than Soviet anti-Semitism or communist ideology. This explains why they still prefer their Western employment.

Conclusion

As we can see, the informants acknowledge all the advantages of Western academic capitalism – such as mobility, international contacts, professional privacy and earning money in decent conditions. These factors show what upward mobility means for them. Thus to be a mobile academic means to be internationally networked, professionally respected and gainfully employed – as well as to feel free to move geographically. On the other hand, the informants also see very clearly the evils of Western academic capitalism, including (a) a long journey to tenure ('life-on-the-road'); (b) life on grants and publications; (c) bureaucratic responsibility for teaching – the orientation toward the oligapollistic client; (d) conflict between the demands of work and family; and (e) the necessity of personality change – the identity metamorphosis that they do not welcome.

Unfortunately, the net result of these reflections is ambivalence, meaning that migrating academics do not easily adjust to global capitalism, though the latter may create conditions for quite prolific academic work. Their vision of academic work clashes with Western values. In this connection, academic capitalism may contradict their Soviet legacy – what they were used to. However, academic capitalism also offers a variety of ways to incorporate their Sovietishness. Will they take up this offer? This is the issue I am going to explore in the next and final chapter. In doing so I will address the question of how they understand the globalization of higher education and their own place in the 'cosmopolitan academy'.

Chapter 7. Discussion and conclusion: Power and ambivalence in academic life

Introduction

This chapter is an attempt to show that academic life is a very complex phenomenon that creates contradictions and paradoxes in people's identities – the ambivalent feeling that can be generalised in terms of 'disruption' (or non-placement) versus 'congruency' (or anthropological richness). The discussion of this identity conflict returns me to the disagreement between Auge (1995) and Miller (1998), mentioned in the introduction. Conceptualising post-modern mobility as de-personifying, Auge (op cit) refers to some 'transitional' places (including airports) as the illustrative cases of this mobility and evaluates them as devoid of meaning. At the same time, Miller (op cit) objects to such de-personifying non-placement of the post-modern movement and consumption. As I understand this scientific dispute, Auge describes this non-placing mobility from the point of view of the newcomer, making his first steps into the transitory state. This first experience of being post-modern or mobile causes discomfort, as the person does not know what to do with his new life and feels lost in the unfamiliar world of the airport of life. However, more experienced travellers – regular airport dwellers – fill such airports and other transitions with new and often unique meanings, thus turning them into anthropologically rich places. If we look at mobility from this angle, Miller's position complements rather than contradicts Auge's theory. Thus mature mobile academics – as illustrated by the majority of my interviewees – regularly attend conferences, have their 'favourite airports and airlines' and schedule very specific activities into their 'non-placement' space.⁶⁰ They confess that the most convenient time for them to review somebody's article for a journal, to think over one's own emerging grant proposal or to rehearse one's own conference report is flight time or while waiting for a flight. In his advice to a tyro-academic, M(Z) recommends 'being very active and advertise yourself - that is, attending many conferences and asking

⁶⁰ M(Q) says about his first experience of the international conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota, 'I was profoundly shocked, displaced and lost in that glamorous world. I did not know how to behave and I felt not fit for it. It was a very uncomfortable feeling...Now I just cannot imagine myself without it'.

famous people to read your papers because they are most likely to do it while en-route from such conferences – this is what we all usually do...this is when we usually help young academics’.

This is just an introductory illustration of how people may come to understand initially uncomfortable environmental changes. It helps us to see that there is no absolute understanding of disruption – just as, according to Foucault, there is no absolute power or its absence. Thus the idea of the ‘academic airport’ I introduced in previous chapter and illustrated in the previous paragraph reveals its prolific potential for developing the academic career. The most crucial point is how academics themselves understand their own transition. To what extent are they capable of recognizing the ‘airport’ benefits and of discovering the anthropological richness of what may seem disruptive? In other words, to what extent are they capable of acknowledging the new opportunities to exercise power? In this connection, here in this chapter I return to the earlier raised issues of power and identity, as conceptualised by Foucault and summarised in the chapter on methodology. To understand how this transient and omni-present power is exercised through the disruption of career and the responsive reinvention of identity, I study the concept of academic work as affected by globalization and exile.

Academic ‘drift’

The previous chapters show the academic career chronicle – that is, the main series of academic events in the lives of my informants – and their reflections on the most crucial events or turning points, thus leading to a logical question, ‘Overall, are their lives successful?’ - or ‘Are they happy with their lives?’ This question returns us to the issue of post-modern identity – fragmentally ambivalent or ambivalently fragmented – as understood through the power-knowledge relationship. The answer to this question depends on the degree of consistency they see in their lives and on their ability to recover after discontinuities – thus terminating and resuming the exercise of power. That is why here I review how they see their entire academic lives and trajectories in terms of coherence versus disruption. The consistency of the occupational life is correspondingly described by Sennett (1998) and Auge (1995) as ‘continuity’ and ‘an anthropologically rich place’. Sennett (op cit), however, blames

globalization for disrupting this coherence and leads us to see the post-modern career as that of 'drift': mobile yet disoriented.

Academic frogs and orcas

Writing about mobility and identity, sceptic analysts of globalization usually understand these phenomena correspondingly as the 'drift' and 'self-destruction' attributed to post-modern risk:

The model of an ordinary successful life...of early decision and commitment...permanent and monogamous...These assumptions...are increasingly inappropriate today. The landscape through which we move is in constant flux...A set of discontinuities is created by the shifting business and industrial environment (Bateson 1989: 6-9).

Flexible capitalism has blocked the straight roadway of career, diverting employees suddenly from one kind of work into another. It is quite natural that flexibility should arouse anxiety: people do not know what risks will pay off, what paths to pursue (Sennett 1998: 9).

According to Sennett (1998), the two major factors contributing to post-modern risk in career development are (a) temporal discontinuity and (b) absence of long-term employment (or geographical discontinuity). They do not necessarily impede professional success. In this respect, Sennett observes that a post-modern person can appear quite 'prosperous'. However, these factors *do* largely damage character. In other words, a person may be quite successful without, however, feeling comfortable about this success. Sennett (op cit: 31) defines the identity of those unhappy but successful as the split identity of 'drift' – a person who is 'both a successful and confused man'.

The comparative analysis of modernity and post-modernity shows that the modern narrative of 'linear time' and 'cumulative achievement' led to a very positive social identity based on 'a sense of self-respect' and 'social honour' (Sennett op cit: 15). As a result, the modern individual felt like 'the author of his life', and this narrative provided him a sense of self-respect. On the contrary, the post-modern career trajectory is *devoid* of 'linear time' and, consequently, of 'cumulative achievement'.

In this connection, Sennett pinpoints the *narrative of fear* in the course of the post-modern career development. Analysing time management paranoia, he remarks that in spite of their wealth, post-modern people 'fear they are...losing control over their lives' because of difficulties with 'managing time' (op cit: 19-22). As he further clarifies, 'the motto "no Long term" has brought the fear of instability'. Risk-taking, related to temporary jobs and short-term contracts, has become 'disorienting and depressing' (op cit: 76).

Sennett (op cit: 31) illustrates emotional instability as a human consequence of globalization and remarks that this negative effect reveals itself routinely. 'Woven into the everyday practices...instability is meant to be normal'. Its 'inevitable consequence' is 'the corrosion of character'. The 'corrosion of character' means (a) 'disoriented action' over a life course; (b) 'loosened bonds of trust and commitment'; and (c) 'divorce of will from character'. The most 'brutal' form of this identity demolition is a widely used statement "I lost my nerve", which 'erodes from within' (op cit: 91).

The idea of loss of nerve, career phobia or non-placement are anthropological categories used in parallel by Auge (1995), Bateson (1989) and Sennett (1998) to describe the neurotic responses to disruption, which I understand as a behaviour causing a particularly unpleasant period. Writing about 'non-places', Auge shows that the disrupted life may lead to 'feeling nowhere'. Thus he emphasises disorientation, whereas Sennett stresses the element of fear – while both of them actually write about the confused identity in their understanding of Bauman's (1991) post-modern 'ambivalence'.

In other words, Sennett (op cit) leads us to see that the 'corroded' career-seeker of post-modernity often behaves like a disoriented and helpless paranoid. He sees himself as *disoriented* because he does not feel like the master of his own life. He does not know what to do with his life. He cannot trust anyone and does not see any sense in his own commitment. And he feels entirely helpless as he knows whatever he does will be a result of the force of circumstances rather than his independent choice. All these 'risks' of advanced modernization – as conceptualised by Beck (1992) – turn him into a career phobic.

Writing about the unhealthy nature of post-modern career-addiction, Sennett (op cit) thus offers us a new framework for analysing human lives but does not, however, explain what factors can constitute this drifting circumstance. Applying this idea to the context of academia, I understand the disruption of academic life as any period when an academic person experiences a deficit in desired and invigorating working conditions, regardless of what causes this shift. Among the cases of academic disruption represented by my informants, I identify the Soviet 'noddy job' (the Soviet '*sharashka*'), totally disconnected from academic work or intellectualism. Looking back at F(X)'s story, she had this type of disruption twice – first in the informational agency under the supervision of the 'stupid colonel' and secondly in the USA working in a Chicago hospital and later being placed on governmental 'hand-outs' while in Boston. Another type of academic disruption can be an academic placement at a lower ranked institution or department and consequent absence of intellectual work – the academic paradise exile described earlier. The highest incidence of these disruptions is found in F(Y), who was 'jumping from one quagmire to another – just like a frog'. Or disruption can be caused by a particular power change, represented by a particular boss, as in the SAS cases of F(Y) and M(B). The informants also recognise academic disruption in emigration, with a multitude of temporary jobs and research topics before they find tenure (see F(Z)'s soliloquy 'Different workplaces...', Chapter 5, Section 'Academic non-placement').

Looking at the life stories of my informants, I see how different the academic career is from the traditional understanding of career even through the prism of post-modernity. Sennett's approach offers us additional space for further understanding of career. There are two basic characteristics I have noticed from the interviews. First, their academic careers – whether in the Soviet Union or in the West – are always discontinued and their academic identity always resembles a drift. Apart from the 26-year-old F(V), every one of my twenty-two participants experienced academic disruption – and more than once – either in the Soviet Union or in emigration. They clearly recognise these circumstances as their turning points, which enable them to take risks and to make 'revisions' and 're-judgements' while 'meeting a challenge' (Glaser 1959: 100).

At the same time, their careers are never temporally discontinued and geographically unstable at the same time. If we consider the academic lives of my informants after their emigration – that is their trajectories in the West – the informants themselves clearly recognise linear time management. This element of the classic modern career is not found by Sennett (1998) in his studies of organizational careers. The participants unmistakably recognise this linear time management in their post-exilic academic careers:

M(Q): It was a crucial publication in the top rank journal '*CELL*'... I moved to London for a year to work on the Fellowship from the Royal Society... I was in the research group that published a successful article in '*Nature*'...I applied for the Medical Research Council (MRC) and the Wellcome Trust Fellowship and got the MRC Fellowship, which was the most prestigious.

M(X): ...Princeton... Cambridge...Now I am moving to Canada. This is all one logical chain –the logic of academic work in the West. First, you find a PostDoc in a prestigious University, then lectureship somewhere, and then tenure professorship.

M(J): It never happened in the Soviet Union.

According to M(Q), this linear time management is akin to Murphy's Law: every new publication, every new conference contact and every new grant increase your chances to receive another:

M(Q): The higher the formal achievements, the faster the career progression in the Western academy...Grant reputation means everything. A higher status attracts grant money like a magnet. Winning one grant after another, you have access to *everything*. The more grants, the more publications. The more publications, the more grants. This is what the Western academic career is mostly about: to plan your reputation and to fit this strategy into your time schedule.

Thus all my informants acknowledge how realistic and important it is in the West to plan their careers, publications and conference trips, and also to calculate their networking connections. What makes their post-exilic careers incoherent and drifting is the absence of long-term employment in the Western academy. The informants themselves recognise this painful drifting towards tenure. Their vision of the Western academic career reminds me of an Odyssey through the Pacific Ocean.

There are a lot of streams around. Each of them can offer you a particular time management scheme but you are never sure what stream and where you will join unless you achieve tenure. As observed by M(G), 'Here it is a totally different world, which is much wider than the Soviet Union, and it is not easy to mainstream into it. I was adjusting to the American life with many difficulties'. And M(X) compares this drifting with 'a headlong race'.

In contrast, their pre-exilic, Soviet, careers were drifting in another sense. I would like to call it 'drifting in still waters' or 'quagmire drifting' – as the narrative of the 'quagmire' is an essential feature of their Soviet reminiscences. Marked with lifetime contracts, economic stability and a certain degree of social respect, the Soviet academics, in many cases, were still devoid of possibilities of independent linear time management. This is where they were constantly undergoing a deficiency in power-knowledge. They had neither power to move from that drifting condition nor the knowledge of how to seek this power. Thus academics could live in one and the same department or institution for years and often without freedom to move or progress in a timely manner. This is what the Soviet academic games and wars were all about - how to find and join the right tribe where you could obtain the right information on and the 'licence' for academic mobility. In their academic stables linear time management was granted from above and to particular members of the academic tribe. A voucher for time management is perhaps a way of understanding academic tribalism.

What is more challenging – the Soviet 'still-water-drifting' (being the 'academic frog') or the Western pre-tenure 'drifting-in-the-ocean' (being the 'academic Moby Dick')? There is no clear answer here because the informants themselves are not sure about this. Thus the Soviet quagmire drifting was associated with the lack of mobility whereas the Pacific drifting is about the lack of emotional stability.

The sceptical analysis of career development provokes the question of whether a positive career identity is possible at all. Referring to the roller-coaster nature of both career and life, Brown (1996: 56) explains the positive career identity, or a successful life trajectory, in terms of 'career resilience':

Career resilience means the ability to recover from and grow as a result of the environmental pressures and obstacles in the domain of work; the ability to adapt to changing circumstances, even when the circumstances are discouraging or disruptive.

Career resilience is a response to the phobias of time management and identity loss. For example, Bateson (1989: 9) looks at the phenomenon of career resilience as a capacity 'to explore the creative potential of interrupted and conflicted lives...in which commitments are [not lost but] continually refocused and redefined'. Like Brown (1996), she stresses the importance of robustness and adaptability to environmental change. In this light, the ideas of mobility and career progression acquire a new interpretation.

Opening new chapters: Academic mobility and improvisation

It may be paradoxical, but Sennett (1998) does not reject the idea of mobility as such in using the term 'drift'. It is evident that the mobility concept is present even in his views. Of course his understanding of mobility is different from London's (1983) point of view mentioned in Chapter 3. London (op cit: 621) sees mobility as a relatively focused movement upward though he does not specify the precise parameters of this direction. He only remarks that the 'upward mobility sub-domain [within people's identities] includes the needs for advancement, recognition, dominance, and money'. Thinking in such broad categories (except perhaps for the 'money' concept), he thus leaves us enough space for further reflections on mobility. In my understanding, the realisation of such goals as 'advancement', 'recognition' and 'dominance' involves the processes through which power can be exercised. Blumenthal et al. (1996: 104) understand academic mobility as 'a means of achieving social and disciplinary/professional qualifications' and thus stress its 'intellectual and attitudinal effects on individuals'.

In other words, people with strong career identities - 'career patriots' (as M(G) calls himself and his colleagues) - strive for upward mobility, represented through the situations where they can exercise their academic power such as scholarly reputation and scholarly status. Deriving from the processual nature of power, we may ask what upward mobility actually means for the informants or what academic status actually is, returning to Chapter 2. The 'upward mobility',

mentioned by London (1983) is probably more than a synonym for 'vertical mobility'. It is a multi-dimensional movement that leads to the re-integration of experience and an invigorating re-connection of academic life.

For example, the informants' individual trajectories – as presented at the very beginning of Chapter 5 - show that one of the main components of career progression is self-perception of mobility, which may later determine self-assessment of success. Mobility may be visible (how others see your progression) and real (how you yourself see it). Self-perception of success derives from the person's real mobility, from how the person himself sees his career growth. For example, M(X) agreed to make a step downwards, from Junior Researcher at one institution to Intern at another (Landau), because for him the latter affiliation was more important regardless of service terms. Therefore, he considers this movement as a progressive step, as a bit of success in his career development. He thinks so because eventually he got to 'an amazing institution...Landau'. On his career ladder, he 'stepped down with moral satisfaction' at that point. In contrast, M(S) made the opposite journey getting a higher position at a less prestigious place. As we can see, the informants' movement downward may actually become more productive for their career development than the apparently successful upward movement, which is illustrated by the SAS early-career cases of M(X) and M(B).

Thus the informants show that their routes to academic paradise – and therefore to their life re-connection - lay through the positively coloured downward movement and academic airports: 'I knew I had to wait a little. I knew it would be worth it'. F(D)'s most recent job at Princeford, which is a lower status academic position compared with her Soviet career, also became a way of re-entering the academic Eden for her. This is how the entrance and the return to the academic Eden were negotiated, which made them part of active career planning. An academic may feel regret about under-estimating the power of the downward mobility. For example, M(E) still regrets the chance he missed ten years ago - when he turned down the possible opportunity (of the 'prolific downward mobility') at Stanford because he was afraid of the uncertainty related to the short-term offer from Stanford. 'The Stanford temp could have become the start of my new brilliant career', as he notes. However, he was afraid of this academic airport and decided not

to take the risk, thus impeding his way to the academic paradise. Perhaps through the prism of post-modern 'risk, mobility should be understood as a roller-coaster ride rather than a linear progression – which is resonant with the amorphous configurations of post-modern geometry.

In reference to the issues of post-modern mobility and progression, Bateson (1989) thinks about the career Odyssey as not a drift but a quest 'in ambiguity for one's own kind of integrity' (Bateson op cit: 13). It is important that in the course of this journey, a career minded person should 'learn to improvise' (Bateson op cit) and 'look at the world with the hawk's eye' (informant M(X)). Thus the understanding of a prolific working life by both anthropologists and my interviewees is that of 'an improvisatory art' (Bateson op cit).

To clarify this approach and to stress the positive aspect of the career change, researchers have recently introduced the concepts of 'boundaryless career' and 'protean career' – the notions that are absolutely applicable to our understanding of academic life. The 'boundaryless career' is a 'model of the work environment in which individuals face multiple discontinuities and opportunities for new beginnings in their careers' (Higgins 2001: 596). The academic boundaryless career – which in this thesis, may be recognised as a trans-national academic career – is the opposite of the classic organizational career, 'drawing its validation and marketability' from one and the same employer (Higgins op cit). Thus moving to other academic institutions, including those abroad, migrating academics must open new chapters in their boundaryless careers and prove their expertise from outside their previous workplaces and even nation-states – that is on a global level.

What education research may definitely borrow from general career theories is the idea that globalization enables the academic career (like many other careers) to be boundaryless – that is, more individualised and not forever bound to a particular organizational context. Individuality is another feature of both globalization and the boundaryless career. In this connection, Hall and Mirvis (1996) introduce the concept of 'protean career', or individual career – as complementing the concept of boundaryless career. The protean career – which, in my thesis, is particularly reflected in the post-emigration phase - is the 'new career, contradictory to the

traditional organizational or institutional career, imposed upon the individual' (op cit).

Applying this concept to higher education, Hall and Mirvis' (op cit) idea can be translated as organizational academic careers usually shaped by academic institutions and under the tight control of the nation-state in many cases – the phenomenon mentioned earlier (see Chapter 3). On the contrary, a protean academic career is a career: (a) shaped by the academic individual; (b) based on 'self-direction and driven by the person's search of self-fulfilment'; and (c) unique to each academic person. Thus the 'protean career' stresses the idea of individualization in career planning and progression, whereas the 'boundaryless career' places emphasis on change as developing one's career rather than disrupting it. The 'discontinuity' becomes an essential part of the overall career continuum (Higgins 2001).

Protean careers become especially meaningful under conditions of globalization, which, according to Bauman (1998), proclaims no order untouchable. Because the academic career is inherently protean and creative (Baldwin and Blackburn 1981; Clark 1986; Weiland 1994; 1995), it is difficult to plan in advance. And depending on 'inspiration' (M(S)), it is 'bound to chance' (M(X); M(B)). As Lindholm (2004: 618) observes, vocational paths may often seem 'fortuitous' for academics themselves. 'You never know what your academic fate has in store for you', says F(X). Thus the individual career trajectories of my informants are very different from each other – as we can see from the six illustrative cases in Chapter 5. What is chance – just a cluster of fortuitous events? As scholarly literature illustrates – supported by my interviews – tribal affiliations provide more access to such events (Becher & Trowler 2001; Bourdieu 1988; Hall & Mirvis 1996; Higgins 2001). According to Bourdieu, it is the information distributed through tribal networks that enables academics to be proactive and foresee career change. Thus tribal affiliations – whether on the local or on the global level – foster a desirable career event and provide their members with a sense of control over the situation. The 'lucky chance', frequently mentioned by my informants, must thus be understood as a resource for accumulating the academic capital that is restricted for some and relatively open for others. In other words, all these academic games and wars are those over the ability to control one's own academic future. The exercise of academic power can be thus

conceptualised through this thesis as the techniques of monitoring one's own academic career development – through occupying higher positions, moving to better places and geographical dislocations. Status depends largely on how a person is tribalised. M(S) attributes his lack of career progression in the Soviet Union to the fact of being '*nichei*' (Russian) – out of tribe, affiliated to nobody, not tribalised properly. In fact, who occupied higher ranks in the Soviet academic world? Those were the academics tribalised within the octopus-like power relations led by the communist party. Who mostly travels to international conferences now? These are the academics diasporised in the emerging knowledge economy either as sojourners (academic emigrants) or as 'academic fruit-pickers' ('academic *shabashniks*') living in their homelands. Who applies for and receives prestigious post-doctoral positions? Again these are the young academics included in trans-national affiliations. As acknowledged by Marginson and Sawir (2005) – who deploy 'Castells' sociology of networking' – globalization expands the boundaries of existing academic tribes and also fosters the emergence of new ones. What is remarkable about those tribes is that their membership is not exclusive, as a trans-national tribe does not prohibit its members from other affiliations. This explains the multitude of living styles and identities emerging within the context of globalization.

The impact of globalization upon the academic career is definitely under-examined. Globalization may actually foster the 'lucky chance' as a driving force of academic career. In fact, globalization creates a variety of conditions for being simultaneously in different places. These conditions of academic trans-nationalism include international conferences, grants and publications. Thus globalization stabilises itself, or its disruptive effect, from within. Here lies the self-invigoration and the self-reproduction of academic life. For example, the Soviet - visibly linear - career progression was for those tribalised within their departments; whereas globalization, with its trans-national mobility, allows academics to tribalise on a larger scale and establish the qualitatively different – that is administratively much looser - tribal relations of the academic diaspora (Weinrod & Levy 2005).

These flexible relations strongly support the protean existence of academics. That is why looking at my informants, I recognise their academic lives as very protean because there are no two stories alike among them. There are, of course,

certain commonalities such as academic disruption, drifting, or the constant opening of new chapters in their academic lives. But still these drifting conditions and these new chapters are very individual for each informant. The factual information from their stories (as presented in the 'Academic career chronicle') also shows that even the negative change (including gates and academic paradise exile) led to the net result of career development rather than disruption. The proof is their recent placement in Western Universities, including very prestigious institutions and even tenure positions. After having been unfairly dismissed or non-placed they eventually got to places like Harvard and MIT. As M(S) says, 'The harder my Life became, the harder I tried to survive'. In this respect, I also see their academic careers as 'boundaryless' – the life where the disruption opens a new chapter rather than closes it. However, I cannot call all of them resilient because the career resilience suggests the positive psychological reaction to change. Some of my informants have resilient career identities, such as F(D), F(E), M(H) or M(S) – since they see their previous negative experiences as 're-integrated' into their overall coherent life stories. As M(S) says, 'I see my life as one coherent line – as one coherent story – the Soviet Russian academic'. For others, their negative experiences have had a long lasting 'paralysing' effect.⁶¹ Making a re-integration effort, they still cannot cope with this paralysis. In my opinion, one of the most successful academic stories is that of F(X), who has been working in Princeford for twenty years. I can say from my personal experiences that Princeford is the dream of the majority of academic emigrants. The reason I decided to interview F(X) was because I was very curious about how she could manage to find a job at such a University. I did not expect her to still think in the subjunctive mode about the disrupted life in Moscow. For example, she says, 'If there hadn't been those anti-Semitic gates in the 1970s, I would have become Professor at the MSU by the age of forty'. Such 'if'-sentences are indicators of lost academic paradise.

⁶¹ Reckson and Becker (2005: 107) divide recounted experiences of pain and disruption into the stories of 'reintegration' and 'paralysis'. In '*stories of reintegration* memories of traumatic events' act out as 'meaningful experiences that could be integrated into the course of the whole life'. On the contrary, in '*paralysed stories*' painful episodes 'remain a series of traumatic and random events'.

Nevertheless, all of the interviewees made an effort to open new chapters in their lives recovering after their disruption. They did it several times. For example, F(D), F(Y), F(W) and M(S) re-discovered teaching as a new and productive chapter after their exile from Eden as early as in the Soviet Union. And of course, the emigration became a new chapter for all of them in response to the economic and cultural disruption of their academic lives. As F(X) remarks, 'America gave me a new life – a piece of fresh air'.

However, their stories reveal that though highly productive, these new chapters often add to their drifting conditions as they now have very ambivalent feelings about their nationality and part of this ambivalence is their Soviet Russian attachments, which make them feel very nostalgic and behave and identify themselves as belonging to the Russian/Soviet intellectual diaspora.

Academic cosmopolitanism and Russianness: Identities in exile

Academic diaspora

Interpreting their own drifting and reconnected lives through their responses to my questions, the informants come to the conclusion that they are a Russian diaspora. And seeing themselves as a diaspora, they persistently try to understand their connection with Russia and the Soviet Russian academy – but through the prism of their global experiences. As we noted earlier, globalization is viewed as the intensification of the world's consciousness. It means that the new connections between the distant and the local through changes in economics, politics and culture create new identities and make the feeling of homeland more amorphous, providing a wider space for a multitude of homelands.

Clifford (1994: 310) observes that in exile people often develop a new type of national identity – the 'diaspora consciousness' or 'diasporic identification', which is sub-national. Unfortunately, there is a lack of consensus about the overall features of diaspora. Among the variety of models describing the concept of diaspora, I would like to work with the model offered by Safran in 1991 and slightly modified by myself into the 'MADRID' model. According to Safran, there are six defining

features of all diasporas. For the purposes of clarify and better memorization, I suggest we use a keyword referring to each feature. First, diaspora is a 'minority community dispersed from the original centre and established in two or more foreign centres' (op cit). And I would like to call this feature '*Distance*'. Second, diaspora 'continues to maintain mythical and other attachments to their [old] homeland'. Thus for me, diaspora is associated with a *Myth*. Third, diaspora is a 'foreign minority: not fully accepted by and are alienated from the host society in which they live'. And being foreign means *Alienation*. Fourth, diaspora has a 'dream of the future return to the true homeland' – the so-called *Dream of Return*. Fifth, diaspora is 'concerned about or engaged in restoration of the [lost] homeland'. I could paraphrase it as the *Restoration* project of the diaspora. Finally, diaspora has 'group consciousness...[that operates] through the homeland-connected aspirations and activities' – the diasporic *Identity toward homeland*. If we further re-order and abbreviate these six features as Myth, Alienation, Distance, Restoration, Identity and Dream – we have the 'MADRID' diasporic model.

As evident from 'MADRID' and other models of diaspora, the central construct of diasporic consciousness is the affiliation with the old homeland. And this is what makes diaspora different from other 'forms of territorial displacement' – that is, more specific than just 'exile' – notes Malkki (2004: 24), who sees 'diaspora' as 'the segment of displaced nation'. Freedman (2005: 147) further also views diaspora as a 'segmented cultural space'. In other words, both Freedman and Malkki point out to the cultural congruency and gravitation toward the old homeland as the main features of diasporic life, which is important for understanding the difference between diaspora and other trans-national life modes. Diaspora is meant to preserve national culture in exile rather than produce just a new exile culture. We can enquire about the processual aspect of this cultural congruency: How – in what situations and through what techniques – do diasporans preserve their national culture? Friedman (2005: 148) remarks that 'networking activities' of diasporans may largely contribute to this preservation. From his point of view, 'Diasporas are reflections of global systematic relations; they are social organizations in which recruitment, membership and a series of group-based activities and identity are clearly established within a global network' (op cit). However, the diasporic intra-connections and activities are

just one cultural process - related to the diasporic 'entrepreneurship' (Darieva 2004). Another process within this 'cultural experiment' – as Darieva (op cit) defines the diasporic cultural reproduction - is nostalgia or 'the hypochondria of the heart' (Boym 2001).

Stressing the strong emotional aspect of diasporas, Anderson (1991) invites us to look at them as 'imagined communities'. His famous statement implies that diaspora is probably how mobile people collectively imagine themselves and behave in accordance with this imagination. Thus diaspora is a way of thinking about oneself that stimulates a certain mode of behaviour and fosters the reproduction of a new, diasporic, reality.

In reference to the imaginary nature of the diasporic reproduction, I would like to ask how legitimate is it to define my informants as a diasporic segment and in what ways they may imagine themselves as diasporics. Here are certain features in their lives and thinking modes that show that these people match one of the earlier presented 'MADRID' model and can be viewed as a specific segment of the Russian diaspora - that is, the Soviet Russian intellectual diaspora. The findings presented in the previous two chapters show that my informants do fit the 'MADRID' model.

Firstly, my informants see themselves as a minority community dispersed from Russia, which is sometimes rotating with them (like Mr.β), and established in several countries (the 'Distance' feature):

M(O): There are plenty of us scattered around the world. There are very few countries where you could not find Russian mathematicians.

M(W): There are so many of us all over the world that I have recently figured out that there is another physicist in California who has my surname. Amazing!

Secondly, they continue to develop "mythical attachments" to their old homeland (the 'Myth' feature). While describing these attachments, the informants often use a variety of 'reflexive metaphors' (Jain 2005: 529) – such as 'colossal stimulus', 'colossal starting point', 'the only place where I could be happy' and 'amazing place', which help them to re-position themselves towards Russia. As M(X) notes,

'The more I was alienating from the Soviet Union, the warmer my attitude to it was becoming'.

What is an undeniable fact in all these reflexive metaphors is the emigres' recognition of Russia as a meaningful, though surrealistic, homeland, even in spite of their long-term exile: 'I cannot simply cut it away. Russia is undoubtedly in my heart', says F(X).

Thirdly, the informants recognise themselves as a foreign, not fully accepted, minority and therefore, feel alienated from the host society in which they live (the 'Alienation' feature). The feeling of alienation may emerge as that of non-existence or 'immigrant non-placement'. For example, F(X)'s alienation is part of her nostalgic paradox, described later in this chapter. She says, 'I am not an American in any shape. I can repeat it ten times: I love this country very much, appreciate its culture and consider it very healthy. But I will never become an American! Never!'

Fourthly, the respondents dream about the future return to Russia as their true homeland (the 'Dream' feature). Some of them view their return to Russia as a realistic and positive turn in their careers. Thus, M(O) declares, 'I am constantly thinking that I might come back to Moscow...If I ever decide to work in Moscow, which may happen one day, I will go only to Steklovka... I dream about working at the MSU even more than at *Steklovka*'. He believes he knows exactly where he will return. Others set certain conditions of their possible return and use the subjunctive mood:

M(X): I would come back if the living conditions were civilised and not shameful for me and my family. Under such circumstances I would eagerly come back to Russia.

Fifthly, they are concerned about the restoration of their old homeland (the 'Restoration' feature). The restoration effort often emerges in response to the feeling of guilt for the emigration and – as in the case of M(O) – can be inspired by a particular example of the informant's mentor: 'Like him [the mentor], we must grow the next generation of Russian scholars'. Or it may be a short-term initiative such as M(X)'s proposal of 'the intensive quick-modular volunteer teaching at the MSU'.

Unfortunately, this restoration may be incomplete, as M(X) evidences, because of the weak centre of diasporic gravity: 'We were surprised that there was no response

from the University staff. It was a sort of dormancy. There are very many Russian academics that are eager to collaborate with the West. Yet it does not work out in the Moscow academic circles'. In reference to such cases of science repatriation, Kuznetsov and Sabel (2006: 5) speak about the '*Garcia*'-effect, meaning that powerful diasporas can largely transform their homeland knowledge economies. They mention the case of Ramon Garcia, a Chilean expatriate in the USA, whose biotechnological innovations quickly modified the Chilean technical infrastructure. As Kuznetsov and Sabel (op cit) observe, '10 Garcias could transform entire sectors of the knowledge economy in [global talent donor] countries'. Kuznetsov and Sabel further attribute the donor countries' failure in the implementation of the Garcia effect to the processes described by Brass (1994: 83) as 'elite competition'. Within this contest, the homeland governments often look at powerful diasporans as their political competitors and therefore may not allow them, in many cases, to get involved in crucial decision-making. That is why, applied to the Russian context of knowledge production, the involvement of intellectual diasporas remains mostly of the illusory nature.

In spite of such barriers, my participants still display their group consciousness through Russia-targeted aspirations and activities (the 'Identity' feature):

F(Q): Of course, I am Russian, only Russian, here. Who else
 can I be!

M(E), M(H): I am a Russian scholar.

M(X): I belong to a certain mathematical school, which dates
 from Kolmogorov...He referred to us as a group.

This group consciousness reveals itself as a fusion of geographical and occupational affiliations. And even those who resist any affiliation with Russia and firmly deny any chance of coming back (for example, M(B) and M(Z)) still remain Russian through their group consciousness.

Following Safran's model [Myth (2), Alienation (3), Distance (1), Restoration (5), Identity (6), Dream (4)], Russian academic émigrés thus can legitimately be called a diaspora. But how far do these diasporans stand from Russia

in their exilic spaces? This question can be answered through the study of their diasporic memories and nostalgia.

As a diaspora, they have a very specific and complex relationship with their academic homeland – the relationship reflected in their diasporic memories and their nostalgia. As research acknowledges, every diaspora has national memories and a certain intensity of homesickness (Clifford 1994). These are the two distinct, yet mutually complementary, categories to understand the reinvented identity of Russian academics in emigration. In other words, they miss Russia and they keep remembering it. That is why I would like to study these categories below, starting with the issue of how they remember Russia.

In the opinion of Clifford (1994), diasporic memories may be both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ – just like memories of any nation (Smith 1999). According to Clifford (op cit: 312), diaspora consciousness can be ‘produced positively through identification with world historical cultural/political forces’ - such as “Africa”, “China” or “Russia”. The positive memories of my informants are something that first kept them from emigration and bound them to Russia and later stimulated their nostalgia in exile. The positive memories are mostly related to the ‘golden age’ and ‘national heroes’, as Smith (1999) remarks. In my case, the academic golden age is first of all related to the climate of intellectualism in the Soviet academy. The understanding of this golden age is typically connected to the 1960s - the epoch of the ideological Thaw, rehabilitation and societal improvements, and partially with the perestroika (F(Z)), when most academic martyrs were resurrected. The informants also admit that there were some ‘islands’ of intellectualism even in the epochs of stagnation (Brezhnev) and perestroika (the latter epoch was very controversial for the Russian academy). Those were isolated places of golden age localization against the overall background of intellectual non-placement. Such foci of intellectualism existed primarily within the Russian academic centre, including Moscow, Kazan, Novosibirsk and St. Petersburg, and pointed to a huge gap between the academic centre and periphery in the Soviet Union. This gap is shown in the narrative by F(D), when she describes her academic paradise exile from Kazan to Voronezh. One of my informants, a 40-year old man from Novosibirsk says, ‘When I was travelling to work I had a feeling of going up to the Russian centre. When I was

returning home from the academic city to the Novosibirsk low-class suburbia, I felt like descending to the periphery'. M(J) expresses the same opinion, 'Living and working in the academic city of Novosibirsk, I felt like a man from the centre. Yet while on business trips to Chelyabinsk, a greater, industrial, town, I felt like a peripheral man'.

The golden age of the Soviet Russian academy is also associated with concrete academic 'heroes' or 'intellectual giants' – the people the informants call 'intellectual Titans' and their 'intellectual grandfathers' (as described in Chapter 6).

Thinking about their 'halcyon days', the informants recall either the Soviet 'cult of science', including informal professional communication with outstanding, scholars, as well as the economic stability in the Soviet academy. Thus their Soviet legacy is not only their Russianness but also their Soviet totalitarianism. As Bauman (2001: 144) remarks, 'human self-construction and self-assertion carries...the seeds of democracy mixed with the spores of totalitarianism'. In his opinion, the 'flexible' identities of late modernity are 'to be pregnant with unlikely twins: with human rights – but also with what Hannah Arendt called "totalitarian temptation" (op cit). The 'frogs' – with whom the participants frequently compare themselves – are very long-living animals. As the informants admit, the loyalty to their academic quagmires, could give them the maximum of economic security. As the American poet Ogden Nash would say, 'No cash to be earned, no cheques to be burned':

If these positive memories become the focal point of nostalgia (which is not surprising), the negative memories allow the informants to justify their choice of emigration. In this reference, Clifford (1994: 310) generally remarks that diaspora consciousness is inevitably 'constituted negatively by experiences of discrimination and exclusion'. Among these painful recollections are the memories of enforced party membership and/or enforced CPSU allegiance as a pre-requisite for career promotion in the USSR, as found in M(E)'s case. The negative focus of the memory bank is very individual. For example, F(X) focuses her bitter memories on anti-Semitism while M(S) mostly thinks about economic and ideological issues. Yet in the majority of cases, there are actually three most striking characteristics of the whole Soviet academy that contribute to its unattractive face in the diasporic memories: the ideological 'idiocy' and the reactionary 'cynicism' and 'hypocrisy'.

It is obvious from the narratives of my respondents that their negative and positive memories go side by side and one and the same place often evokes quite controversial reminiscences. For example, in the Soviet 'cosmopolitan city' of Moscow, the 'imperial capital' of socialism (Kofman's 2005 terms), there were both the cosmopolitan academy and anti-intellectualism.

The MSU and the SAS continue to arouse the warmest memories such as 'the temple of science', 'my promised land and my worship' (M(Y)), 'the best years of my life' (F(X)), 'an amazing place' (M(X)) and 'the most sacred spot on Earth' (M(O)). Yet exactly the same people explicitly connect these particular institutions to anti-intellectualism in their knowledge production patterns. These contradictions are fragments in their complex 'compartmentalised' identities.⁶² And taken altogether, these 'compartments' (Formani's (1993) term) – 'impregnated', as Hoffman (1990) says, with episodes and characters - lead to the overall ambivalence of the interviewees' self-identification, which makes them both exilic and nostalgic, hating and loving Russian at the same time.

Nostalgia

The memories of the nation are just one angle to look at how diasporic – disrupted and re-connected - identities take shape in exile. The memories of the nation are a more generic category to look at displacement and re-connection. The memories of the nation generalise the emigrants' experiences as relatively widespread phenomena, experienced by the whole nation.

Another angle from which we can study identity and life re-connection is nostalgia (or 'homesickness'). It is a narrower analytical category that can clarify the above set questions. This angle helps us to understand my respondents' relationship with Russia. A study of nostalgia has the focus on specific episodes within their positive memories, or the 'golden age memories' that eventually cause pain, discomfort, ambivalence and disruption and impede the re-connection of their lives

⁶² Formaini (1993: 15) refers to the condition of identity 'compartmentalization' – which means 'living in compartments' that are not related. As she explains, 'when you are in one, you are not in another: your life is not a continuum'. For me, reconnecting one's life means trying to be simultaneously in several compartments – the coordinated compartmentalization or fragmented ambivalence. Though your life is still fragmental, the good thing is that it is also ambivalent because that there is an attempt to connect all your compartments.

and consequently, their exercise of power (power as self-knowledge facilitating action).

Within the nostalgic focus of the Russian academic emigres is the old Russian culture. For the majority of my informants, this culture is associated with the 1960s, though officially those years were already the remains of the vanishing pre-revolutionary culture, dating to Vernadsky (and his academic tribe) and even earlier. And the Russian intellectual nostalgia thus reflects the old Russian culture that was later modified into the culture of the Soviet intelligentsia, as based on communist ideology and Soviet patriotism:

F(X): There is something I appreciate about the Soviet style of living...That spot, where the best was crystallised and polarised in the Soviet Union is invaluable, absolutely precious for me. For example, there were some absolute values, including cultural values, in the Soviet Union and I miss them here very much.

As the informants themselves explain, these nostalgic values are associated with 'charity work', 'more giving than receiving' and 'informal lifetime friendships'. F(X) understands the intensity of her nostalgia as deriving from the source of these values – that of resistance to power. Thus emerging as trophies in the 'wars for power', such values are especially memorable for those who once obtained them:

F(X): I cannot deny that our [Soviet] culture was very sick. Still I know from my personal experience that there was a category of the Soviet intelligentsia that existed despite the transplanted from above ideology. The necessity of opposition woke up the best intentions and motives in people.

Boym (2001) points to the 'Russian souvenirs' she found in the houses of Russian émigrés in America and Germany – the 'reminders', or signifiers, of Russianness. My informants, the Russian academics in exile, nourish their own symbolic souvenirs such as subtle reflections on and pieces of art about Russianness:

M(G): My everyday culture is completely Russian. I enjoy reading only Soviet and Russian books.

F(X): My [second] husband and I read the same books and cried over the same movies. We have absolutely the same domains

of reflections. We often recall how we had watched one and the same theatrical production in Moscow and had sung the same songs long before we had met in the USA.

Through such intellectual or symbolic souvenirs of their nostalgia, Russian academic diasporics try to reproduce this culture very zealously yet, in many cases, inefficiently, as they themselves confess:

F(W): I am losing this fleeting, running away, intellectual beauty. I feel that I am losing my affiliation with this evanescent beauty of Russian intellectual thought. I manage to restore it only through my lecturer course on Russian Literature and Culture. For me it is a sort of rehabilitation of my hidden, second, "self".

As M(G) notices, this culture is 'not transmitted from generation to generation'. Neither can it be successfully transplanted in its classic format to the West:

M(Y): It is both very didactic and rather sad to see the Great Russian mathematical school dieing or, more precisely, dissolving in the Western culture. Unfortunately, many good Russian mathematical traditions (such as close and non formal contacts with students, the system of marking, organization of lectures, tutorials and exams, long mathematical seminars etc.) cannot be imported to other countries and therefore are disappearing, coming into oblivion.

As impacting upon their diasporic behaviour, their nostalgia for the lost academic homeland can be summarised as nostalgic paradox, nostalgic mirage and nostalgic myopia. The way I understand their nostalgia here is that it focuses on the previously mentioned contradictions of their diasporic memories. When we talk about their nostalgia, we talk about the controversies within their diasporic consciousness. That is why the effect of nostalgia is of a paradoxical nature. In this case, nostalgia creates a surrealistic picture in people's minds and leads them to self-deception. And in my understanding, these are the conditions of disruption and power loss.

According to Boym's (2001) research, nostalgia itself may create a variety of ways of disempowerment. Meaning 'homesickness', nostalgia de facto conveys an element of pain, as she remarks. In my opinion, the nostalgia of my informants is akin to drug addiction – when you touch something nice and exciting but eventually

it makes you feel sick. Here their nostalgia shows the episodes that make the informants addicted to Russia. I understand the nostalgic paradox as the following contradictory situation. They love Russia but most of them do not want to come back and even those who dream of coming back evidently postpone the repatriation and find various excuses to stay in their new homeland.

Another feature of their homesickness is what I would like to call the nostalgic mirage. They always miss the vanishing Russian intellectual/academic culture that is lost in time - the segment of the Soviet Russianness that does not exist anymore. Thinking about Russia and reflecting on their own preferences, they invariably contrast the positive side of yesterday's Russia (that is, the Russian academy the way it was in the 1960-80s) with the negative side of today's West. Thus nostalgically myopic, they compare, for example, the undesirable pressure of having to produce grant proposals and publications in the West with the pleasant informal communication in Soviet Russia but not with the impact of the Soviet ideology or with the most recent *maquiladora* circumstances in Russia. Popkewitz (2003: 268) reminds us that 'images and narratives do not only produce new memories of the "self" and nation-ness, but also ways of forgetting'. The nostalgic case of my respondents demonstrates how selective and situational this national forgetting can be, thus becoming a powerful technique for identity re-invention.

This nostalgic myopia leads to the frequently mentioned phenomenon of 'cultural schizophrenia' or 'identity split'. Their 'schizoid identities' are illustrated by their self-perception as both 'still Russian' and 'not Russian anymore'. Thus they feel affiliated both to the Russia that is lost in time and to the post-modern West. As remarked by M(Q), 'I am very deeply rooted in the Moscow soil...Yet I understand that I cannot live in Russia anymore. At the same time, I do not want to live in the West. I see myself in-between the two cultures. And I don't know how to explain it'. M(G) concludes, 'Here I am a Russian shell piece, a meteorite, yet ingrained in America'.

Their nostalgia thus leads to the formation of the trans-temporal social space. The academic paradise they are nostalgically longing for is mostly what they think it *should* be, which is manifested in their narratives of exile and regain. The landscape of this paradise is of the changing shape. The closer my informants came to their

emigration or to the Soviet collapse, the more amorphous the configurations of their imaginary academic paradise became. In their early career stages, the paradise was associated with the MSU – or even with a specific faculty such as the MechMat. However, later it acquired a broader – trans-national – geographical meaning, for example, ‘America’ or ‘the West’. Now, at the points of their final destination, their paradise is an ideal, also compared with the Soviet Russian academy in their reminiscences. That is why they construct the trans-temporal social space within their cultural trans-nationalism. This explains why they cannot come back. They do know that their academic paradise – the homeland they want to be – does not exist. The faster the social context of your homeland changes and the earlier you leave it – the wider your trans-temporal space is. It can actually occupy the whole of your identity. In this sense, my informants are a relatively homogenous group: they left Russia before or immediately after the Soviet collapse, having managed ‘to catch ‘the last train of socialism’, as M(G) mentions. Thus almost all my interviewees are still the ‘passengers’ on this ‘last train of socialism’, uneasily located between America or Britain today and Russia yesterday.

As I have already mentioned, globalization fosters protean careers and new identities by bringing in desirable events and situations. These new identities are, however, ambivalent and even painful. In this connection, Bauman (2001: 143) observes that though ‘Proteus may be a symbol of the potency of self-creation...protean existence is not necessarily the first choice of a free human being’. It may lead us to think of academic emigration and the improvisational nature of life itself as the force of circumstance rather than the first choice. That is why ‘new feelings of attachment and identity inscribe anxieties and displacements’, causing contradictory attitudes and behaviours (Popkewitz 2001: 184).

Looking at their nostalgia and Russianness, we can clearly see how ‘the images and narratives structure a memory through which individuals locate themselves as having a “home”’ (Popkewitz 2003: 263). Thinking nostalgically, the respondents thus activate what Popkewitz (op cit: 265) conceptualises as ‘national imaginary’ or ‘system of collective belonging and the accompanying anxieties’ within which ‘the local [Russian/Soviet]...is used to consider the particular historical sites through which power circulates’.

The nostalgic monologues of my respondents clearly show that they constantly compare the two distinct modes of academic professionalism in terms of intellectualism versus anti-intellectualism. Popkewitz (2003) would probably find these cognitive processes quite natural for academic emigrants. In his opinion (op cit: 282), 'Discourses of professionalization...are hybrids that simultaneously embody global and local principles'. In this connection, Schulte (2004) recognises a common trend among academic diasporans from traditional societies. She observes that when comparing their homeland academies with those of the host societies, academic emigrants inevitably 'investigate the ways in which one system of scientific methodology [Russia or China] and discourse scrutinises and evaluates another [America]' (op cit: 307). In her opinion, the nostalgia of academic emigrants is the "reversed Orientalism", which 'sheds light on recent discourse about "Eastern" and "Western" knowledge production and knowledge exchange (op cit):

They attempt to establish the uniqueness of the national culture in the context of today's internationalised and to some extent also "deculturalised" academic landscape...Employing an Occidental perspective, they set up dichotomies such as "Eastern" spirituality, intuition...versus "Western" rationality...By means of this "reversed Orientalism" they stress the incompatibility of "East" and "West", turning the second component of each dichotomy into a negative foil of a positively perceived "Eastern" characteristic...This is the quintessential post-colonial paradox, that is, to define an authentic cultural identity in opposition to Western civilization leads to a nostalgic and uncritical return to a "pre-colonial" past, a past that was invented by the Empire itself (Schulte 2004: 311).

As a result of this reversed Orientalism and post-colonial academic thinking, the emerging cosmopolitan academy comprises distinct national academic cultures, such as 'German intellectuals in exile' (Neuman 1976), the 'exile of the Arab intellectual' (Said 2004), 'Russian academic in emigration' (Zuyev 1998), 'Russian science on the rack' (Freemantle 1997), or 'Chinese academic diaspora' (Welch & Zhen 2008).

The nostalgia of my informants is thus a tool to understand their search for identity. Desperately trying to understand who they are in emigration, they constantly lose themselves in this ambivalent globalizing world – which is, by the way, comprised of other diasporas, as researchers note (Bauman 1991; Clifford

1994; Malkki 2004; Weinrod & Levy 2005). In fact, if they are a particular national diaspora taking shape under the impact of the planetary brain drain - the question to ask should be, 'How do they interact with other intellectual diasporas that take shape on the same grounds and constitute the cosmopolitan academy, as several scholars acknowledge (Altbach 2004; Marginson 2008; Welch & Zhen 2008)?' We can further try to see how this affiliation – if there is any – may help them to reconnect their disrupted academic lives.

Final destination: Diaspora without homeland?

Searching for some coherency in their journeys, we can look at many articles and policy reports on academic mobility, which is a popular topic in scholarly debates. Musselin (2004: 55) remarks that recently 'European

policies are strongly oriented toward the promotion of student and academic mobility and the creation of research networks and projects within Europe'. The official discourse of academic mobility rotates around its 'geographical definition', as noted by Blumenthal et al. (1996: 104). They clarify that the widely discussed concept of international mobility 'applies to students, researchers and teaching staff in higher education who move from an institution in one country to another institution abroad for a fixed or indeterminate period' (op cit). Global faculty relocations are seen by the Bologna Declaration as 'a tool to create a European Higher Education Area (EHEA) by 2010' (Sedgwick 2003) by 'mobilising all Europe's brain power and applying it in the economy' (European Commission 2005: 5).

In this connection, Musselin (2004: 56) remarks that the official documents on academic mobility 'generally present it as something positive and associated with all kinds of benefits':

Among the many objectives that can be attached to these policies, one can outline the creation of a common area within Europe and the reduction of the divergences among European countries through the development of exchanges. Increased mobility and partnerships within the EU may have various effects, from the construction of common norms and practices among European academics to the building of the so-called European Research Area and European higher Education Area (op cit).

These benefits are 'widely recognised' as 'a Europe of Knowledge', with the emphasis on a 'European citizenship...capable of giving its citizens the necessary competences to face the challenges of the new millennium, together with the awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space' (Bologna Declaration as cited in Sedgwick 2001). In more specific terms, policy reports and studies approach academic mobility as leading to knowledge 'extension and re-distribution' (UNESCO 1992) or in terms of 'recruiting foreign candidates' (Musselin 2004: 65) or 'exporting – importing' knowledge (Sedgwick 2001). Marginson and Sawir (2005: 297) observe that this discourse leads to the dream-scape ideology among the masses, based on the popular 'dreams of universal mobility' – when 'every leakage of talent fed into imaginings of a single global pool of academic labour'. If there is any 'confusion' about 'citizen choice', it can be 'avoided' entirely by 'sufficient compatibility between the different national regulations' (European Commission 2005: 6).

As is evident, this discourse looks at academic mobility solely through the prism of economic globalization and hyperbolizing lenses. According to the economic understanding of academic mobility, 'draining...academics go where the economic...gravity pulls them' (Marginson & Sawir 2005: 297). A sceptical eye, however, will recognise some contradictions within this discourse. Thus in the opinion of Blumenthal et al. (1996: 95), international mobility 'opens opportunities but also poses problems for staff and students alike (Blumenthal et al. 1996). That is why an organic development of this discourse would be an investigation into the perception of increased mobility by the sojourning faculty themselves.

In the introduction, I posed some general questions, related to how my informants understand their own lives while standing where they are now. Coming back to those questions, here I would like, first of all, to explain how they see globalization, which, as my research shows, 'has drastically changed their quagmire existence'. First they see it as a positive force that facilitates their emancipation from totalitarianism and gives them economic profit and normal working conditions. They also see globalization as a chance to realise their long-term dream of mobility.

In the Russian context, they, however, understand globalization as a devastating force – the force that destroys the Soviet Russian culture and the Russian

academy because the latter is impossible without the former and visa versa. According to M(Y), 'In the Soviet Union there was an excellent educational system – the excellent Soviet University. That is why the academic tradition had been alive in spite of the fact that many academic people were 'squashed' (informant M(E)) by the regime. Now the commercialization of higher education in Russia destroys the system as such and thus 'murders' the academic people by turning them into maquiladoras and fruit-pickers'. M(Y) explains that the Soviet University was like the 'Temple of Science', within whose walls there were the 'robust seeds of intellectualism', left by Vernadski and Mr. β , even after those academic heroes had been eliminated (also see F(X)'s monologue 'I cannot deny that our [Soviet] culture was very sick' in this chapter, in the section on *Nostalgia*):

F(X): The closed, authoritarian, society instigated such mechanisms that made people defend their principles and think over the meaning of life and its moral values.

M(Y): That virus of intellectualism was spreading like a prolific disease among those who saw themselves as the "chosen" to carry on the Soviet academic tradition. And no repressions could stop it. They could eliminate specific people but no one could stop this powerful intellectual epidemic. Now the new Russian market is smashing these good old walls and act out as a very strong antibiotic against this fungus. That is why the Soviet academic culture is vanishing under such lethal injections.

And as my research shows, this 'academic culture' is reproduced through the diasporic life – but mostly in its imaginary form of nostalgia. However, the informants admit that compared with its Russian counterpart, the Western market offers a much weaker cure for this 'fungus of intellectualism'. The 'life-on-grants' and the 'Damocles' Sword' of publications are meant to foster competitiveness among academics - which, in the long run, sharpens their 'intellectual subtlety and killer instinct', remarks M(E). He further explains that it is the global Western market that teaches the academic to be 'intellectually picky and purposeful in achieving his goals'. In addition, the grant money earned in global Universities - as he adds - eventually gives the academic 'a substantial portion of intellectual freedom – no one likes competing for grants but absolutely everyone enjoys living on the grant money'. And this is 'the reward you receive for your loyalty to the global

Western market', says M(Q) – the intellectual freedom supported by a good salary, according to previously mentioned Graham's (1998) statement (see Chapter 3, Section 'Knowledge production and academic emigration').

Thinking about Russia and about the globalizing world, how do the informants see their own place in the latter? First, they do recognise the existence of the cosmopolitan academy, without any doubt, as comprised of diasporas (like themselves). Second, they clearly see themselves as part of this cosmopolitan academy. My informants frequently mention, 'I belong to the international/cosmopolitan intellectual/academic diaspora'. Some sociologists of nationalism find this statement 'international diaspora' nonsensical since in the traditional sense diasporas cannot be international or cosmopolitan. In theory, 'diaspora' presupposes strictly national affiliation with a particular homeland. However, when explained by the informants themselves, this identification acquires its own sense. As we can see from their stories, being 'Russian' and 'international' are not mutually exclusive, which is so much different from their previous Soviet mentalities. When I asked them to explain what they mean by 'international' or 'cosmopolitan', M(S) said (and this view was shared by others):

'International' means that there are many of us, diasporans from different countries, in Western Universities. It also means that we travel a lot and have international connections. 'Cosmopolitan' means that we have just been to many countries...and I do not like the word 'exile', to be honest. However, I have not forgotten that I am a Russian diasporic. I am a Russian academic from the US.

In other words, they mean: we are Soviet Russian academics in the West and there are identical social groups, with no less interesting stories, from all over the world here. As Kuznetsov and Sabel (2006: 9) remark, 'intellectual diaspora networks become part of a new, cosmopolitan elite'.

In this reference, we can see that the concept of international intellectual diaspora is almost entirely bound to the professional context. In these applications 'diaspora' becomes devoid of its 'homeland' component. For example, when talking about Russia, they mostly refer to their old homeland and think through their national memories. However, when talking their international academic diaspora, they describe their networking activities and think in terms of the diasporic

entrepreneurship. However, these networks – regardless of how vibrant they are – cannot fully compensate for their loss of homeland. That is why, being international diaspora, they still continue to be the Russian diaspora as well. Here we come to see the double-diaspora effect – the simultaneous self-identification as the international scientific diaspora and the Russian diaspora. As evident in the conclusive statements of the informants' self-identification, their cosmopolitanism is always diluted by their Russianness:

Interviewer: How do you introduce yourself at conference? When, for example, you are asked, 'Where are you from?' – what do you say?

M(E): I am a Russian scholar from the UK.

Obviously, their cultural (civic) engagement is either with other international diasporans (or cosmopolitans) or with Russian diasporics – but very seldom with natives and under the influence of such factors as marriage (in the cases of F(W) and F(Z), who are married to Englishmen).

In some cases, globalization creates very dense cosmopolitan diaspora. For example, F(B), M(Q) and M(H) describe their departments as comprised of 'the most talented academics from all over the world'. In other cases, the cosmopolitan diaspora may be *thinner*, diluted with larger Russian intellectual islands on the Mississippi or in Massachusetts. But regardless of the cosmopolitan density, the element of academic internationalization is *always* very strong. They enjoy international conferences, mutual international projects and other trans-national connections. They start their working day in their offices from checking and replying to e-mails from all over the world. The international contact, particularly through conferences, is the most pleasant part of their global work. The new national – diasporic – consciousness of post-modern intellectuals or post-modern academics is being largely moulded by conference capitalism or academic network capitalism, which has become a new stage in Mann's (1988) 'pub capitalism'.⁶³ We can call it

⁶³ Mann (1988) emphasizes the role of 'entrepreneurial capitalism', 'barbershop capitalism' or 'pub capitalism' in forming national consciousness. The idea is that with the advent of modernity, people started to socialize in pubs and barbershops within relatively steady circles and thus their national consciousness began to shape. The idea is based on the search for kindred spirits in pubs and barbershops, which have always had distinct class differences,

academic pub capitalism. The academic pub phenomenon means that academic conferences have actually turned into academic pubs, which are more than a step in career progression. The post-modern academic conferences are 'places in-between' or academic campsites, where intellectuals stay over before resuming their Odysseys. These post-modern conferences are the academic campsites or intellectual stop-over places for the cosmopolitan academic diaspora in general and for the Russian academic diaspora in particular. This is what the informants think about the role of conferences in their lives.

As academic pubs, conferences are undoubtedly associated with Auge's (1995) 'anthropological places'. For example, M(G) and F(B) stress the emotional richness of conferences as anthropologically rich places, which often act out as invigorating pleasure activities. F(B) also views these 'luxurious' academic pubs as a manifestation of material comfort and elitism because they facilitate informational exchange and development of 'bourgeois' knowledge, the knowledge that is not for everyone. Besides she acknowledges the importance of conferences as benchmarking activities.

As is evident, my respondents appreciate this academic pub capitalism and this academic life in the compressed and constantly expanding academic world. Coming back to the reciprocal dichotomy of the compression – expansion, I call their cosmopolitan living space compressed because they can be simultaneously in different places. As they themselves remark, 'I have a very intense conference route. There are several conferences I regularly attend that take place approximately simultaneously. For example, two months ago, I spent five days in China, the next five days in Vancouver, and the next five days in Italy. So I can actually be on three different continents over just a fortnight'. On other hand, their academic space is constantly expanding because every attended conference and every published article adds a new contact to their cosmopolitan networks.

so those steady circles were not also ethnicity based but also class based. Mann stresses the intra-national communication of early modernity: to develop as a nation, people need to communicate to their kindred spirits who have the same 'ethno-national bonds' (Connor 1993) and they find such kindred spirits within their class.

These and other, previous, illustrations of their empowerment and identity re-invention lead us to summarise our observations on the techniques of the academic power. In fact, how can power and resistance be exercised? 'If you want to exercise power, try to create your own tribe' (M(X)) and 'become an academic duke yourself' (M(E)). An illustrative case is Mr.β's organization of his own academic tribe, mentioned by M(G), M(S), M(Y) and F(Y). Within the already existing, both official and historical, frame of power – the Kolmogorov's Soviet mathematical school – Mr.β created his mathematical clubs for high school students, later recruited as students and even faculty members at the MechMat-MSU. This contingent included M(G), M(O), M(Z) and M(X). Then – during the anti-Jewish campaign – his tribe was expropriated through his dismissal. In emigration he re-gained his own tribe through diasporic networking. Having emigrated, he helped his former tribe members to go to the West. Now this diasporic network is based on the connections established by Mr.β and includes even those who once 'betrayed' him such as M(S) and M(G). Here we can see three techniques of exercising academic power: the dismissal/exile of a tribal leader, with the preservation of the decapitated tribe; creation of one's own academic tribe; and recreation of the lost tribe. As we can see, these techniques did not affect the peripheral tribal members, who managed to make their own careers and adapt to the changing environment. Thus the visible absence of the exercise of power can become another source of power – with the 'meek inheriting the University' (Mueller 2004: 20) while the leaders fight for specific positions. Here we can see that the anti-intellectual identity, such as adaptor, can be also an outcome of a game – when academics become anti-intellectual in order to survive. This is the reverse re-invention of academic identities. M(G)'s example is the continuous re-production of this reverse-identification, as he himself confesses. After the brilliant start of his academic career, he switched to applied science, where he is still resting on his old laurels only because this is 'more fashionable' and 'more convenient'.

In connection with this re-invention, we can raise some further questions. One question is to what extent the identities of my informants are truly intellectual and positive. When most of them – except M(H) and M(E) – declare that they were 'anti-Soviet' or 'anti-Sovetchik', should we believe this? Another question is to what

extent a Soviet academic can be globalised, considering the fact that the majority of my informants emigrated at the establishment and maintenance stages of their Soviet careers. Most of them identify themselves either as 'academic victims', or the disciples of academic heroes, or academic loners and buccaneers. In this case, the narratives of silence – the stories told by my informants about their colleagues – become the only reliable proof of the complexities and controversies of academic identities. Mr.β, Academician O and Professor A from the narratives of M(S), M(E) and F(X) correspondingly were very talented and world famous scholars and the same time academic godfathers and godmothers in both the positive and negative meaning of this word. They embodied a very complex and crude network of academic *cosa nostra* relations. Thus both Mr.β and Academician O were 'despotic perfectionists', whereas Academician O was also 'a very cruel academic duke' and Professor A was a KGB officer. These contradictions were possible because the social environment – the overall playground of academic games - was very controversial, which is evident from the informants' narratives.

Their new life mode – the life of academic diaspora - is thus a way to re-locate the earlier mentioned positive cultural values by disconnecting them from the negative social context, such as Soviet ideology. However, out of this context, M(G), F(X) and F(W) continuously repeat, these values gradually vanish as they become devoid of any meaning. That may probably explain why F(W) and F(Z) persistently try to resist their diasporic affiliation.

Have they now found what they wanted? Absolutely yes, indeed they have. They wanted mobility and they found it. But they lost stability. As M(W) remarks, 'In emigration you always gain something – but you also lose something. And here where you decide what is more important for you – to lose or to gain'. It is paradoxical but what they tried to escape and what eventually led them to emigration now causes frustration making them re-assess the concept of liberty. They came to see the existence of different parameters of academic emancipation.⁶⁴ For example, in the Soviet Union, it was associated with mobility. The still-water factor developed claustrophobia in the most prolific academic people and the responsive neurotic

⁶⁴ To avoid confusion, I deliberately use the term 'academic emancipation' instead of 'academic freedom'.

desire to run loose to the headway. Now they understand the meaning of their academic emancipation in terms of obtaining emotional stability, control over their lives and freedom from responsibility. And in this connection, they do not feel emancipated in the West and often recall their advantage in the Soviet quagmire.

How are they going to cope with this identity conflict? Are they going to return to Russia? No, they are not. And this is not surprising since this attachment is of the illusory, mythical, nature. As Glaser (1959: 92) remarks, 'One can look back, but he can evaluate only from his new status'. In this context, their re-assessment of their own freedom becomes a way to their empowerment. They feel more empowered and knowledgeable through their discontinuities, losses, disillusionment and re-connection. Having gone through this reverse disruption by their disillusionment from emigration, they now have a better idea of how the world operates and they feel like after 'the ice-cold shower' – when 'suddenly everything becomes crystal clear', remarks F(W):

I miss the way I was before. There was a time when I was thinking in bright images through associations. Now everything has changed. I know that I have undergone a metamorphosis that is frightening me. I lost all this, which is very sad. But the way I am now I feel much stronger. I feel that my life does not depend on anyone but myself.

In fact, F(W) – as well as my other informants – looks at the world through quite realistic lenses. Thus they admit that if they return, their professional life will be free from responsibility but still economically unstable. Now Russia can offer only stability as the freedom from instructional responsibility. They are still determined to search for and to find economic stability here, in the West – through the tenure track. This is a very hard journey but they are willing to take it. And they are willing to pay the price of nostalgia, isolation and hard work for Western stability in the cosmopolitan academy.

Conclusion

In summary, my research on the identities of academics in exile would not have been possible if it were not set in the context of globalization and post-modern identity. Globalization means the compressed and expanded world, which is runaway, dislocated and confused.

Comparing the global academy with its modern prototype, researchers point to the most essential features of the former as follows:

1. the environment of *academic capitalism* (commercialization and independence from the state);
2. the mission of *internationalization* and the principle of *trans-nationalism* (demanding a 'thinner' structure of academic networking);
3. Mode Two of *knowledge production* (central role in knowledge economy or knowledge industry and the consequent global knowledge production)
4. *localization* in strong nation-states (generally leading and competing in globalization);
5. increased *academic mobility* (through international exchanges, trans-national employment and academic emigration/exile) increased mobility of academics; and
6. the *cosmopolitan academy* or academic cosmopolitanism (formation of new collective academic identities).

The portrait of the global University is represented through the following features, reflecting both its hardware and software. The corporate or international life of post-modern Universities demands that their academic cadres should develop more professional and national flexibility, to a certain extent crossing the borders of both their long-term academic job sites and nation-states. Researchers acknowledge the increased mobility of people involved in building global educational networks and refer to the phenomenon of brain drain or competition for new talent (Castells 2000; Florida 2005; Kenway & Fahey 2006). These scholars note that post-modern academics tend to become the core of this brain drain or category number one in global labour. Some of them work trans-nationally. Others decide on emigration in the complete meaning of this word. However, as a heritage of globalization, they inevitably develop new identities. And examination of these new identities is paramount for understanding the essence of what we call the global University. In other words, who creates the new knowledge economy? Who are those mostly attracted by the 'global talent magnets'? These are the faculty members from all over the world, who become the reserve workforce, awakened and utilised by educational globalization.

Thus the overall impact of globalization upon higher education can be assessed as the creation of the cosmopolitan academy – the formation of a specific academic community, comprised of diasporans, living in their trans-national and trans-temporal spaces. Functionally speaking, it is the geographical mobility through which the cosmopolitan academy is being created by globalization. Here we can ask why and how it is so important to study cosmopolitan academy per se.

Of course, we should approach the concept of the global University from the discursive angle of its political and economic expansion. However, this will not be enough to understand the essence of the global academy. To understand the heart of the global University is to look at it from the inside or to examine its software – that is human capital, comprised of people with their skills, and working conditions, such as teaching and learning styles and academic cultures. The term ‘cosmopolitan academy’ reflects the University software or the relations that lie inside and fill in the hardware of the University corporate function. It means that since post-modern Universities serve a variety of states instead of one particular nation-state, such schools require a totally new brand of people. In other words, faculty and students are expected to develop new identities – those that reflect a range of cultures rather than a specific culture of a specific nation-state. The cosmopolitan academy is mostly associated with migrating faculty – those scholars who come from more traditional societies with their modern Universities to the civic West with its post-modern or global Universities. The emerging cosmopolitan academy conveys the following features: social trans-formation of academic identity; trans-national way of life; and new, post-modern, tribalism.

The word ‘cosmopolitan’ presupposes the formation of new identities as an outcome of such cosmopolitan activities as involvement in networking through conferences and grants; travelling through conferences, fellowships or trans-national employment; or knowledge transfer. All such cosmopolitan activities are encouraged by the emerging structural thinness conveyed by internationalization. The core example of the cosmopolitan academy is the cosmopolitan identities of faculty members who participate in the corporate mission in the very direct meaning of this word and thus develop the shared identity or the feeling at home as a result of academic migrations. In practice, however, the shared identity reflects the

negotiations between people's cosmopolitanism and nationalism and takes a variety of forms, due to the delusion of globalization. Referring to this, Rizvi (2004) pinpoints the social transformation of identity as an outcome of the compromise between nationalism and cosmopolitanism. This may lead us to see the cosmopolitan academy as represented through multiple diasporas and discontinuities. As we can clearly see, a multitude of processes are involved in the new understanding of academic career and academic mobility. Moving within a trans-national, global, space, the academic migrants create their own, non-replicable, living space – a trans-national and trans-temporal social space.

This, inner voice, understanding of academic cosmopolitanism is actually in contradiction with the official discourse of academic mobility. The widely advertised discourse of academic emigration (in which the wide spread understanding of academic mobility is grounded) frequently leads to narratives of economic emigration, even among my informants. It may at times cause the superficial understanding of academic career and mobility. This epistemology proves itself inefficient – at least, when applied to the first generation of post-Soviet academics. I sometimes see contradictions in their stories. Their 'economic hardships' were, in many cases, just an excuse, the last straw, for emigration. Coincidentally, they started to emigrate when there were no severe political barriers and there were academic hardships. Thus emigration became suddenly both possible and justifiable. As Boym (2001) remarks, they were just 'sick of home'.

International policy makers want to see academic migrants as happy travellers – emancipated from their homeland and happy with their prolific protean existence – who have found their Ithaca. But my interviewees see themselves as invaders and vagabonds who are ambivalent rather than happy about their own career success.

The discussion above leads me to two main assumptions about the nature of the global academic work – related to its classic (Humboldtian) and diasporic nature. First, the cosmopolitan academy is probably represented through academic diasporas. In this research I look at only one of them – the Russian diaspora - which is the largest, as Altbach (2004) acknowledges. However, I assume that there must be no less interesting cases of the Chinese or Indian diasporas, emerging after the

collapse of the empires. Their careers and identities may be no less interesting, adding to the emotional legacy of the old regimes and its impact upon Western Universities. Therefore, academic life, even in its trans-national context, must be still modern or classic to some extent – since the people who represent it carry the emotional bondage and the ‘seeds of intellectualism’ of their collapsed empires. The classicism of academic life also reveals itself in the fact that unlike any other, organizational, career, the academic life offers time management, which probably makes the post-modern drifting not as painful as in other occupational domains. It also offers more latitude in the understanding of academic mobility because global changes offer a variety of chances to be mobile.

In my research, mobility is what the informants always wanted. Global mobility does conform to their expectations. To a certain extent it does give them what they seek, but not freely – thus adding new problems to their lives. This neurotic mobility – ‘champagne’ mobility (see M(E)’s monologue ‘We were suddenly released’, Chapter 5, Section ‘Emigration routes’, p. 134) - drastically changes their lives and disrupts their identities. They are not lifetime Soviet nationals anymore – they are displaced diasporans in search of their Ithaca. As I have said, global mobility *does* give them what they wanted – that is, freedom from the Soviet way of living. However, it does not easily give them a new home. They are happy to be free from Russia. But are they freed from it since they are not used to living away? Displaced and post-exilic, they start thinking over their lives and through the prism of their *global* experiences. The stories I have collected did not emerge in one or two days of the interview. These are the stories the informants had been telling themselves and each other for a long time since the moment of their emigration. These are the stories without ending because their journeys are not over yet – they have not yet found their stable homes.

Telling their academic migrant biographies is very important for them because through this narration they try to find meanings in their disrupted lives. The ‘academic buccaneers’ – disrupted, re-connected and ambitious – this is how they want us to see them while hearing their voices.

REFERENCES

- Agalianos, A. (2006). 'Crossing Borders: The European Dimension in Educational and Social Science Research', in J. Ozga, T. Seddon, and T. Popkewitz (Eds.), *Education Research and Policy: Steering the Knowledge-Based Economy. World Yearbook of Education 2006*, London/New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Alheit, P. (1992). 'The Biographical Approach to Adult Education', in W. Mader (Ed.) *Adult Education in the Federal Republic of Germany: Scholarly Approaches and Professional Practice*, Vancouver, University of British Columbia.
- Allakhverdov, A. (1996, August 2). 'High-Speed Network Will Link Russia's Far-Flung Universities' *Science* 273: 594.
- Altbach, P. (2001). 'Academic Freedom: International Realities and Challenges', *Higher Education*, 41: 205-219.
- Altbach, P. (2002). 'Centres and Peripheries in the Academic Profession: The Special Challenges of Developing Countries', in P. Altbach (Ed.) *The Decline of the Guru: The Academic Profession and Middle-Income Countries*. Chestnut Hill, MA: CIHE, Boston College.
- Altbach, P. (2003). 'Introduction to Higher Education Theme Issue on the Academic Profession in Central and Eastern Europe', *Higher Education* 45: 389-90.
- Altbach, P. (2004). 'Globalization and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal World', *Tertiary Education and Management* 10(1): 3-25.
- Alvesson, M. (1993). *Cultural Perspectives on Organizations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Amnesty International. (2005, May 27). Amnesty International 2005 Report Cites the Sutyagin case. [On-line image]. Retrieved on May 24, 2006 from: <http://sutyagin.org/eng/archive/000069.shtml>
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities*, 2nd edition. London: Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (1989). 'Small-Scale Techniques and Large-Scale Objectives', in P. Bardhan (Ed.) *Conversations between Economists and Anthropologists: Methodological Issues in Measuring Economic Change in Rural India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press India, 250-82.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Arthur, M. and Lawrence, B. (1984). 'Perspectives on Environment and Career: An Introduction', *Journal of Occupational Behaviour* 5: 1-8.
- Auge, M. (1995). *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Super-Modernity*. London: Verso.
- Azmanova, A. (1992). 'Dictatorships of Freedom', *Praxis International* 12(2): 144-157.
- Bailes, K. (1986). 'Soviet Science in the Stalin Period: The Case of V.I. Vernadskii and His Scientific School, 1928-1945', *Slavic Review* 45(1): 20-37.
- Bailey, F. (1977). *Morality and Expediency: The Folklore of Academic Politics*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Bain, O., Zakharov, I., and Nosova, N. (1998). 'From Centrally Mandated to Locally Demanded Service: The Russian Case', *Higher Education* 35: 49-67.
- Baker, V. and Sumin-Finn, V. (1994, July 15). Soviet and Post-Soviet Science. *Science* 265: 301.
- Baldwin, R. and Blackburn, R. (1981). 'The Academic Career as a Developmental Process: Implications for Higher Education', *The Journal of Higher Education* 52(6): 598-614.
- Ball, S. and Vincent, C. (1998). '"I heard it on the Grapevine": "Hot" Knowledge and School Choice', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 19: 377-400.
- Basil, M. (2006). 'The Marketing Market: A Study of PhD Supply, Demand, Hiring Institutions, and Job Candidates', *Journal of Business Research* 59(4): 516-23.
- Bateson, M. (1989). *Composing a Life*. New York, New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Bauer, P., Stennes, L., and Haight, J. (2003). 'Representation of the Inner Self in Autobiography: Women's and Men's Use of Internal States Language in Personal Narratives', *Memory* 11 (1): 27-42.
- Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and Ambivalence*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1997). *Intimations of Post-modernity*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). 'Parvenu and Pariah: Heroes and Victims of Modernity', in J. Good and I. Velody (Eds.) *The politics of post-modernity*, Cambridge University Press. 23-35.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *The Individualised Society*. London, UK: Polity Press & Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

- Bazeley, P. (2003). 'Defining Early Career in Research', *Higher Education* 45: 257-79.
- Becher, T. and Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories*, 2nd edition, Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Toward a New Modernity*, London: Sage.
- Beck, U. (2000). *The Brave New World of Work*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Becker, G. (2003). Economics: How Globalization Helps the Poor. Business Week, April 21.
- Beeman, W. and Peterson, M. (2001). 'Situations and Interpretations': Explorations in Interpretive Practice', *Anthropological Quarterly* 74(4): 159-62.
- Bertaux, D. (1981). *Biography and Society: The Life History Approach in the Social Sciences*, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*, London: Sage.
- Blaikie, N. (2000). *Designing Social Research: The Logic of Anticipation*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Bluebond-Langner, M. (1978). *The Private Worlds of Dying Children*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Blumenthal, P., Goodwin, C., Smith, A., and Teichler, U. (1996). *Academic Mobility in a Changing World*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Blumer, H. (1956). 'Sociological Analysis and the Variable', *American Sociological Review* 21: 683-690.
- Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bologh, R. (1984). 'Feminist Social Theorizing and Moral Reasoning', *Sociological Theory* 2: 373-93.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Boym, S. (2001). *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York, New York: Basic Books.

- Brass, P. (1994). 'Elite Competition and Nation-Formation', in J.Hutchinson and A.D.Smith (Eds.) *Nationalism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 83-88.
- Brewer, M. (2001). 'The Many Faces of Social Identity: Implications for Political Psychology', *Political Psychology* 22(1): 115-25.
- Brown, A. (2002). 'Reform, Coup and Collapse: The End of the Soviet State' [On-line]. Retrieved March 14, 2005 from the World Wide Web: http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/war/coldwar/soviet_end_01.shtml.
- Brown, L. (1996). *Career Choice and Development: Applying Contemporary Theories to Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Bruner, J. (1991). 'The Narrative Construction of Reality', *Critical Inquiry* 18(1): 1-21.
- Bunchuk, M. (2005). 'The Impact of the New Funding Mechanisms on Russian Natural Sciences' [On-line]. Retrieved May 26, 2005 from: <http://www.geocities.com/CollegePark/Lab/5590/absimp.htm>.
- Burbules, N. and Torres, C. (2000). 'Globalization and Education: An Introduction', in N. Burbules, and C. Torres (Eds.) *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspective*, New York: Routledge, 1-26.
- Burgess, G. and Bryman, A. (1994). *Analysing Qualitative Data*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bush, J. (2004). A Renaissance for Russian Science. Business Week On-Line, August 9. Retrieved May 26, 2005 from: http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/04_32/b3895103_mz018.htm
- Campbell, R. and Cellini, J. (1981). 'A Diagnostic Taxonomy of Adult Career Problems', *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* 19: 175-90.
- Campbell, R. and Rew, A. (1999). *Identity and Affect: Experiences of Identity in A Globalizing World*. London, UK/Sterling, VA: Pluto Press.
- Carrère d'Encausse, H. (1993). *The End of the Soviet Empire: The Triumph of the Nations*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (1998). *End of Millennium*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

- Castles, S. (2000). 'Development, Social Transformation and Globalization' [On-line]. Retrieved May 20, 2006 from: <http://www.theglobalsite.ac.uk/press/012castles.htm>.
- Cherny, E. (2006). *Important State Secret*. New Times, May. Retrieved May 24, 2006 from: http://www.newtimes.ru/eng/detail.asp?art_id=1270.
- Clark, S. (1986). 'The Academic Profession and Career: Perspectives and Problems', *Teaching Sociology* 14: 24-34.
- Clifford, J. (1994). 'Diasporas', *Cultural Anthropology* 9(3): 302-38.
- Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. (1986). *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Close, P. and Ohki-Close, E. (1999). *Supranationalism in the New World Order*. MacMillan Press Limited.
- Coffey, A. (1996). *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*. Sage Publications.
- Comaroff, J. and Comaroff, J.L. (2000). 'Millennial Capitalism and the Culture of Neoliberalism', *Public Culture* 12 (2).
- Connelly, F. and Clandinin, D. (1990). 'Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry', *Educational Researcher* 19 (5): 2-14.
- Connor, W. (1993). 'Beyond Reason: The Nature of the Ethno-National Bond', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16(3): 373-389.
- Corra, M. and Willer, D. (2002). 'The Gatekeeper', *Sociological Theory* 20(2): 180-207.
- Cousins, M. and Hussain, A. (1984). *Michel Foucault*. MacMillan Education Ltd.
- CRDF Immediate Release. (2005, May 12). 'MacArthur Foundation \$10 Million Grant Helps CRDF Strengthen Research Capacity of Russian Universities', *CDRF News and Press Releases*. Retrieved June 7, 2005 from: <http://www.crdf.org/News/051205macarthur.htm>
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in Social Science Research*. London: Sage.
- Dailey, M. and Cardozier, V. (2002). 'Higher Education in Russia' [On-line]. Retrieved October 17, 2004 from: <http://studentorgs.utexas.edu/heaspa/library/rus.htm>

Danilova, E. and Yadov, V. (1997). 'Social Identifications in Post-Soviet Russia: Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Explanation', *International Review of Sociology* 7(2): 319-35.

Darieva, T. (2004). *Russkij Berlin [Russian Berlin]. Migrants and Media in Berlin and London*. Berlin, Germany: LIT Verlag.

Deem, R. (2001). 'Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities; Is the Local Dimension Still Important?', *Comparative Education* 37(1): 7-20.

Deem, R. and Johnson, R. (2003). 'Risking the University? Learning to Be a Manager Academic in UK Universities', *Sociological Research Online* 8(3). Retrieved January 12, 2007, from: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/8/3/deem.html>.

DeFillippi, R. and Arthur, M. (1996). 'Boundaryless Contexts and Careers: A Competency-Based Perspective', in M. Arthur and D. Rousseau (Eds.) *The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Pp.116-31.

Delanty, J. (2001). *Challenging Knowledge: The University in the Knowledge Society*. SRHE & Open University Press.

Della Pergola, S. (2002). 'World Jewish Population, 2002', *American Jewish Yearbook 2002: The Annual Record of Jewish Civilization*. New York, New York: American Jewish Committee, Jewish Publication Society of America, 601-642.

Denzin, N. (1970). *The Research Act in Sociology: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. Chicago: Aldine.

Denzin, N. (1989). *Interpretative Biography*, New York, NW: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Derluguian, G. (2001). 'Recasting Russia', *New Left Review* 12: 5-33.

Desforges, L., Jones, R., and Woods, M. (2005). 'New Geographies of Citizenship', *Citizenship Studies* 9(5): 439-51.

Dewey, J. (1910, September). 'Some Implications of Anti-Intellectualism'. *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods* 7(18): 477-481.

Domonkos, L. (1977). 'History of Higher Education', in L. F. Goodchild and H. S. Wechsler (Eds.) *ASHE Reader on the History of Higher Education*. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.

- Dornan, P. (1975). 'Andrei Sakharov: The Conscience of a Liberal Scientist', in R.Tokes (Ed.) *Dissent in the USSR: Politics, Ideology, and People*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 354-427.
- Dyer, H. (1889). *A Modern University with Special Reference to the Requirements of Science*. Perth, UK: S. Cowan & Co.
- Ellingstad, M. (1997). 'The Maquiladora Syndrome: Central European Prospects', *Euro-Asia Studies* 49(1): 7-21.
- Ellis, F. (1999). *From Glasnost to the Internet: Russia's New Info-Sphere*. New York, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Epstein, A. (1978). *Ethos and Identity: Three Studies in Ethnicity*. London, UK: Tavistock.
- Erben, M. (1998). *Biography and Education*. London: Falmer Press.
- European Commission (2005, April 25). 'Mobilising the Brainpower of Europe: Enabling Universities to Make Their Full Contribution to the Lisbon Strategy', *Communication from the Commission*, COM (2005) 152 Final, SEC (2005) 518. Brussels: European Commission.
- European Commission (2006, May 10). 'Delivering on the Modernisation Agenda for Universities: Education, Research and Innovation', *Communication from the Commission*, COM (2006) 208 Final. Brussels: European Commission.
- Faber, B. (2002). *Community, Action and Organizational Change: Image, Narrative, Identity*. Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Faini, R. (2003). *The Brain Drain: An Unmitigated Blessing?* Oxford: University of Oxford, Queen Elizabeth House.
- Faist, T. (2000). *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Featherstone, M. (1988). 'In Pursuit of Postmodern: An Introduction', *Theory, Culture and Society* 5 (2-3): 195-216.
- Fernandez-Kelly, P. (1995). 'Labour Force Re-Composition and Industrial Restructuring in Electronics: Implications for Free Trade', *Hofstra Labor Law Journal* 10 (2): 623-717.
- Florida, R. (2004). *The Rise of the Creative Class and How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Florida, R. (2005). *The Flight of the Creative Class*. New York, New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can Succeed Again* (Translated by S. Sampson). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fontana, A. and Frey, J. (1994). 'Interviewing: The Art of Science', in Norman K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Formaini, H. (1993). *Men: The Darker Continent*. London: Heinemann.

Foucault, M. (1966). *The Order of Things*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1972). *Archaeology of Knowledge* (Translated by S. Smith). London, UK: London Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, M. (1979; 1983). *The History of Sexuality* (Translated by R. Hurley). London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1983b). 'On the Genealogy of Ethics', in P. Rabinow (Ed.) *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. New York: The New Press, 253-80.

Fox, N. (1998). 'Foucault, Foucauldians and Sociology', *The British Journal of Sociology* 49(3): 415-433.

Freemantle, M. (1997, December 22). 'Russian Science on the Rack', *The American Chemical Society*. Retrieved May 26, 2005 from: <http://pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/971222/russian.html>

Friedlander, P. (1997). *Nazi Germany and the Jews: Years of Persecution, 1933-1939*. London, UK: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Friedman, J. (2005). 'Diasporization, Globalization, and Cosmopolitan Discourse', in A. Levy and A. Weinrod (Eds.) *Homelands and Diasporas*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 140-165.

Geertz, C. (1983). *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Gefou-Madianou, D. (2000). 'Disciples, Discipline and Reflection: Anthropological Encounters and Trajectories', in M. Strathern (Ed.) *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*. London and New York: Routledge, 256-78.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

- Gerber, P. and Yarsike-Ball, D. (2002). *From Crisis to Transition: The State of Russian Science Based on Focus Groups with Nuclear Physicists*, PONARS Policy Memo 220. Washington, DC: PONARS Policy Conference.
- Germann-Molz, J. (2005). 'Getting a 'Flexible Eye': Round-the-World Travel and Scales of Cosmopolitan Citizenship', *Citizenship Studies* 9(5): 517-31.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press & Blackwell.
- Giddens, A. (1997). *Sociology* (3d Edition). Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (2000). *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*. Taylor & Francis.
- Gitelman, Z., Chervyakov, V., and Shapiro, V. (2001). 'Natsionalnoye Samosoznaniye Rossiiskikh Evreyev' ('The National Consciousness of Russian Jews'), *Diaspora* 2: 224-62.
- Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co New York.
- Glaser, B. (1959). *Mirrors and Masks: The Search for Identity*. San Francisco, CA: The Sociology Press.
- Glick-Schiller, N., Basch, L., and Szanton-Blanc, C. (1995). 'From Immigrant to Trans-Migrant: Theorizing Trans-National Migration', *Anthropological Quarterly* 68(1): 48-63.
- Goodson, L. (2004). *Qualitative Research in Tourism: Ontologies, Epistemologies and Methodologies*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Goodson, I.F. and Sikes, P. (2001). *Life History Research in Educational Settings. Learning from Lives*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gorbunova, E. and Zabaev, I. (2002). 'The Role of Universities in the Transformation of Societies: An International Research Project' [On-line]. Retrieved October 17, 2004 from: <http://www.open.ac.uk/cheri/Trmsesprgress.htm>
- GPF/Global Policy Forum. (2003). Defining Globalization [On-line image]. Retrieved April 20, 2006, from: <http://globalpolicy.igc.org/globaliz/define/index.htm>.
- Graham, L. (1964). 'Bukharin and the Planning of Science', *Russian Review* 23 (2): 135-48.

- Graham, L. (1998). *What Have We Learned about Science and Technology from the Russian Experience?* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gray, J. (2006). *The Global Delusion*. The New York Review, April 27, 20-3.
- Green, A. (1997). *Education, Globalization and the Nation State*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Greenfeld, L. and Chirot, D. (1994). 'Nationalism and Aggression', *Theory and Society* 23: 79-130.
- Griffiths, M. (1995). '(Auto)Biography and Epistemology'. *Educational Review* 47: 74-88.
- Gross, N. (2002). 'Becoming a Pragmatist Philosopher: Status, Self-Concept, and Intellectual Choice', *American Sociological Review* 67: 52-78.
- Gudmundsdóttir, G. (2003). *Autobiography and Fiction in Postmodern Life Writing*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Guibernau, M. (1996). *Nationalisms: The Nation-state and Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Hall, D. and Mirvis, P. (1996). 'The New Protean Career: Psychological Success and the Path with a Heart', in D. Hall (Ed.) *The Career Is Dead - Long Live the Career. A Relational Approach to Careers*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Chapter 1.
- Held, D. and McGrew, A. (1999). *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Heller, K. J. (1996). 'Power, Subjectification and Resistance in Foucault', *Substance* 25(1/79): 78-110.
- Higgins, M. (2001). 'Changing Careers: The Effects of Social Context', *Journal of Organizational Behaviour* 22(6): 595-618.
- Hirst, P. and Thompson, G. (1999). *Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance* (2nd edition). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hitler, A. (1940). *Mein Kampf*, New York: Reynal & Hitchcock.
- Hitler, A. (1942). *The Speeches of Adolph Hitler*, Vol.2. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hoffman, E. (1990). *Lost in Translation: A Life in a New Language*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

- Hofstadter, R. (1963). *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Huisman, J., de Weert, E., and Bartelse, J. (2002). 'Academic Careers from a European perspective', *The Journal of Higher Education* 73(1): 141-60.
- Husen, T. (1980). 'A Marriage to Higher Education', *The Journal of Higher Education* 51(6): 616-49.
- Ismail-Zadeh, A. (2004). 'Russian Science in Transition', *EuroScience News* 26: 9-11.
- Jacob, M. and Hellstrom, T. (2000). *The Future of Knowledge Production in the Academy*. SRHE & Open University Press.
- Jain, A. (2005). 'Space and Imagination', *International Review of Sociology* 15(3): 529-45.
- Jary, D. and Jary, J. (2000). *Collins Dictionary of Sociology*. Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Jefferson, A. (2007). The Bullying Boss [On-line]. Academic Leadership, February 12. Retrieved July 26, 2007, from: http://www.academicleadership.org/empirical_research/The_Bullying.
- Jenkins, R. (1992). *Pierre Bourdieu*. London & New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Johnston, A. (2000). *The Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology: A User's Guide to Sociological Language* (2nd Edition). Blackwell Publishers.
- Jones, K. (2006). 'A Biographic Researcher in Pursuit of an Aesthetic: The Use of Arts-Based (Re)Presentations in "Performative" Dissemination of life Stories', *Qualitative Sociology Review* 2(1): 66-85.
- Joyce, J. (1922). *Ulysses*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kaldor, M. (2004). 'Nationalism and Globalization', *Nations and Nationalism* 10(1/2): 161-77.
- Kanter, R. M. (1995). *Change Masters: Corporate Entrepreneurs at Work* (2nd Edition). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kellner, D. (2000). 'Globalization and New Social Movements: Lessons for Critical Theory and Pedagogy', in N. Burbules and C. Torres. (Eds.) *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspective*. New York: Routledge, 299-322.
- Kenway, J. and Fahey, J. (2006) 'The Research Imagination in a World on the

Move', *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 4(2): 261-74.

Kerlin, R. (1997). *Breaking the Silence: Toward a Theory of Women's Doctoral Persistence*. Ph.D. Thesis [On-line]. Retrieved May 14, 2007, from: <http://kerlins.net/bobbi/research/diss/toc.html>.

Kivisto, P. (2001). 'Theorizing Trans-National Immigration: A Critical Review of Current Efforts', *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (4): 549-577.

Kofman, E. (2005). 'Figures of the Cosmopolitan: Privileged Nationals and National Outsiders', *Innovation* 18(1): 83-97.

Kojevnikov, A. (2002). 'The Great War, the Russian Civil War, and the Invention of Big Science', *Science in Context* 15 (2): 239-75.

Korey, W. (1970). 'The Legal Position of Soviet Jewry: A Historical Enquiry', in L. Kochan (Ed.) *The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 76-98.

Korey, W. (1972). 'The Origins and Development of Soviet Anti-Semitism: An Analysis', *Slavic Review* 31(1): 111-35.

Korey, W. (1995). *Russian Anti-Semitism, Pamyat, and the Demonology of Zionism*, Jerusalem, Israel: Harwood Academic for the Vidal Sassoon International Centre for the Study of Anti-Semitism (SICSA), The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Kulski, W. (1956). *The Soviet Regime: Communism in Practice*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Kuznetsov, Y. and Sabel, C. (2006). 'International Migration of Talent, Diaspora Networks, and Development: Overview of Main Issues' [On-line], in Y. Kuznetsv and C. Sabel (Eds.) *Diaspora Networks and The International Migration of Skills: How Countries can Take Advantage of their Talent Abroad* (Forthcoming), Chapter 1. Retrieved November 18, 2007, from: info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/233722/DiasporaCh1.pdf

LaRoche foucauld, F. (1993). *Memoires, Reflexions ou Sentences et Maximes Morales*, Moscow: Nauka.

LeCompte, M. (1993). 'A Framework for Hearing Silence: What Does Telling Stories Mean When We are Supposed to be Doing Science?', in D. McLaughlin and W. Tierney (Eds.) *Naming Silent Lives*. London: Routledge.

Ledeneva, A. (1998). *Russia's Economy of Favours: Blat, Networking and Informal Exchange*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leichtentritt, R. and Davidson Arad, B. (2004). 'Adolescent and Young Adult Male-to-Female Transsexuals: Pathways to Prostitution', *British Journal of Social Work* 34: 349-74.

LentaRu. (2004). Danilov's Colleagues Explained What the Physicist had been Sentenced For [On-line]. November 11. Retrieved on May 24, 2006 from: <http://lenta.ru/russia/2004/11/25/danilov/>

Letokhov, V. (2004, October 18). Science Reforms Hopelessly Lagging Behind [On-line]. Pravda, October 18 [On-line]. Retrieved May 26, 2005 from: http://english.pravda.ru/science/19/94/377/14459_Science.html

Lesley, J. and McGee, M. (2000). *Invented Identities: The Interplay of Gender, Religion and Politics in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levenberg, S. (1970). 'Soviet Jewry: Some Problems and Perspectives', in L. Kochan (Ed.) *The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 29-43.

Lindholm, J. (2004). 'Pathways to the Professoriate: The Role of Self, Others, and Environment in Shaping Academic Career Aspirations', *The Journal of Higher Education* 75(6): 604-35.

Lingard, B. (2006). 'Globalization, the Research Imagination and Deparochialising the Study of Education', *Globalization, Societies and Education* 4(2): 287-302.

Lohman, I. (2006). 'Universities, the Internet and the Global Education Market', in J. Ozga, T. Seddon and T. Popkewitz (Eds.) *World Yearbook of Education 2006: Education Research and Policy: Steering the Knowledge-Based Economy*, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. 17-32.

London, M. (1983). 'Toward a Theory of Career Motivation', *The Academy of Management Review* 8(4): 620-30.

Low, A. (1990). *Soviet Jewry and Soviet Policy*. New York: Columbia.

Malkki, L. (1992). 'National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees', *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1): 24-44.

Mann, M. (1988). 'War and Social Theory: Into Battle with Classes, Nations, and States', in M. Mann *States, War and Capitalism*. Blackwell, Chapter 5.

Marginson, S. (2008). 'Have Global Academic Flows Created a Global Labour Market?', in D. Epstein, R. Boden, R. Deem, F. Rizvi and S. Wright (Eds.) *Geographies of Knowledge, Geometries of Power: Framing the Future of Higher Education (The World Yearbook of Education 2008)*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis (Forthcoming).

- Marginson, S. and Sawir, E. (2005). 'Interrogating Global Flows in Higher Education', *Globalization, Societies and Education* 3(3): 281-309.
- Markusova, V. et al. (2001). 'Russian Grant-Holders' Opinions on Competitive Funding: Results of a Survey', *Scientometrics* 51(3): 541-51.
- Markusova, V. et al. (2004). 'Research in Non-Metropolitan Universities as a New Stage of Science Development in Russia', *Scientometrics* 60(3): 365-83.
- May, T. (2001). *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- McCauley, M. (1981). *The Soviet Union since 1917*. London, UK: Longman.
- McNay, L. (1994). *Foucault: A Critical Introduction*. London, UK: Polity Press.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merrill, B. (2002). *Biographies as Collective Experience?* ESREA: The Biography and Life History Network Conference.
- Merton, R. (1973). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York, NY: Collier-Macmillan.
- Mezirow, J. et al. (1990). *Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, D. (1998). *Shopping, Place and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Miller, S. (1954). 'Threats to Progress: Anti-Intellectual Trends in the Contemporary U.S.A.', *Social Problems* 2(2): 123-24.
- Moran, W. (1968). 'The Study of University Organizations: There is a Scarcity of Research on This Subject', *The Journal of Higher Education* 39(3): 144-51.
- Morrow, R. and Torres, C. (2000). 'The State, Globalization, and Educational Policy', in N. Burbules and C. Torres (Eds.) *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspective*. New York: Routledge, 27-57.
- Mueller, J. (2004). 'Research Ethics: A Tool for Harassment in the Academic Workplace', in K. Westhues (Ed.), *Workplace Mobbing in Academe: Reports from 20 Universities*. Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press, 290-313.
- Mulkay, M. (1997). *The Embryo Research Debate: Science and the Politics of Reproduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

- Munro, E. (1998). *Improving Social Workers Knowledge Base in Child Protection Work*. London, UK: British Association of Social Workers.
- Musselin, C. (2004). 'Towards a European Academic Labour Market? Some Lessons Drawn from Empirical Studies on Academic Mobility', *Higher Education* 48: 55-78.
- Nazarov, M. (2004). *Vozhdyu III Rima: k Poznaniyu Russkoy Ideyi v Predapokalipticheskoye Vremya (To the Emperor of the Third Rome: Toward Understanding Russianness during the Pre-Apocalipsis)*, Moscow, Russia: Russkaya Idea.
- NCS (2006). 'Jewish Emigration from the Former Soviet Union to Israel and the United States: Statistics' [On-line]. Retrieved June 22nd, 2006 from: <http://www.ncsj.org/stats.shtml>.
- Nelson, E. and Lambert, R. (2001). 'Sticks, Stones and Semantics: The Ivory Tower Bully's Vocabulary of Motives', *Qualitative Sociology* 24(1): 83-196.
- Neumann, F. (1957). *The Democratic and the Authoritarian State: Essays in Political and Legal History*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Neumann, F. (1976). 'The Intelligentsia in Exile', in P. Connerton (Ed.), *Critical Sociology*. Penguin Books, 423-41.
- Nove, A. and Newth, J. (1970). 'The Jewish Population: Demographic Trends and Occupational Patterns', in L. Kochan (Ed.) *The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 125-158.
- Ohmae, K. (1990). *The Borderless World: Power and Strategy in the Interlinked Economy*. London, UK: Collins.
- O'Neil, M. (2002). 'Renewed Methodologies for Social Research: Ethno-Mimesis as Performative Praxis', *The Sociological Review* 50(1): 69-88.
- Ozga, J. (2005). 'Modernizing the Education Workforce: A Perspective from Scotland', *Educational Review* 57(2): 207-19.
- Ozga, J., Seddon, T., and T. Popkewitz (2006). 'Introduction', in J. Ozga, T. Seddon and T. Popkewitz (Eds.) *World Yearbook of Education 2006. Education Research and Policy: Steering the Knowledge-Based Economy*. London: Routledge, 1-14.
- Paget, M. (1990). 'Performing the Text', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 19(1): 136-55.
- Papastephanou, M. (2005). 'Globalization, Globalism and Cosmopolitanism as an Educational Ideal', *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 37(4): 533-52.
- Pattie, S. (2005). 'New Homeland for an Old Diaspora', in A. Levy and A. Weinrod (Eds.) *Homelands and Diasporas*. Stanford University Press, 49-67.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Peters, T. and Waterman, R. (1982). *In Search of Excellence*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Pinkus, B. (1988). *The Jews of the Soviet Union: The History of a National Minority*, Cambridge, Mass, USA: CUP.

Pollini, G. (2005). 'Elements of a Theory of place Attachment and Socio-Territorial Belonging', *International Review of Sociology* 15(3): 497-515.

Popkewitz, T. (2001). 'Rethinking the Political: Reconstructing National Imaginaries and Producing Difference', *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 5(2): 179-207.

Popkewitz, T. (2003). 'National Imaginaries, Indigenous Foreigner, and Power: Comparative Educational Research', in J. Schriewer (Ed.) *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 261-294.

Princeton. (n.d.). *Intelligentsia* [On-line image]. Retrieved on September 1, 2005 from: <http://www.cogsci.princeton.edu/cgi-bin/webwn>.

Propp, V. (1968). *Morphology of the Folktale* (2nd Edition). Austin, USA: University of Texas Press.

Rayner, C. (1997). 'The Incidence of Workplace Bullying', *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 7: 199-208.

Rayner, C. (1999). 'Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Bullying at Work', *International Journal of Manpower* 20(1/2): 11-15.

Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Reckson, B. and Becker, L. (2005). 'Exploration of the Narrative Accounts of South African Teachers Working in a Gang-Violent Community in the Western Cape', *International Journal of Social Welfare* 14: 107-15.

Reddaway, P. (1975) 'The Development of Opposition and Dissent', in A. Brown and M. Kaser (Eds.) *The Soviet Union since the Fall of Khrushchev*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rice, A. (1970). *Modern University: A Model Organization*. London, UK: Tavistock Publications.

- Riessman, C. (1993). *Narrative Analysis*. Sage Publications.
- Ritzer, G. (1996) 'McUniversity in the Postmodern Consumer Society', *Quality in Higher Education* 2(3): 185 – 99.
- Rizvi, F. (2004). 'Rethinking Globalization and Education after September 11', *Comparative Education* 40(2): 157-71.
- Rizvi, F. (2006). 'Imagination and the Globalization of Educational Policy Research', *Globalization, Societies and Education* 4(2): 193-206.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rosenthal, G. (1993). 'Reconstruction of Life Stories: Principles of Selection in Generating Stories for Narrative Biographical Interviews', in R. Josselson and A. Lieblich (Eds.) *The Narrative Study of Lives*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Rothbart, D. (1984). 'The Semantics of Metaphor and the Structure of Science', *Philosophy of Science* 51(4): 595-615.
- Rubina, D. (2006). Russkaya Pisatel'nitsa – Izrail'tyanka [The Russian Writer and the Israeli]. *Argumenty Nedely*, December 12, 18.
- Russian Academy of Sciences/RAS. (2000). The Primary Objectives of the Russian Academy of Sciences [On-line image]. Retrieved June 22, 2005 from: <http://www.intertec.co.at/itc2/partners/RAS/Default.htm>
- Safran, W. (1991). 'Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return', *Diaspora* 1(1): 83-99.
- Said, E. (1994). *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. Vintage.
- Said, E. (2000). 'Reflections on Exile', in E. Said *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 173-86.
- Salitan, L. (1990). 'Domestic Pressures and the Politics of Exit: Trends in Soviet Emigration Policy', *Political Science Quarterly* 104(4): 671-87.
- Sartre, J.P. (1956). *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Scholte, J.A. (1997). 'Global Capitalism and the State', *International Affairs* 73(3): 427-452.

Schulte, B. (2004). 'East is East and West is West? Chinese Academia Goes Global', in C. Charle, J. Schriewer, and P. Wagner (Eds.) *Trans-national Intellectual Networks*, Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag, 307-32.

Scott, J. (2006). 'The Mission of the University: Medieval to Post-Modern Transformations', *The Journal of Higher Education* 77(1): 1-39.

Scott, J. and Marshall, G. (2005). *A Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford University Press.

Scott, P. (1998.) *The Globalization of Higher Education*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Sedgwick, R. (2001, March/April). 'The Bologna Process: How it is Changing the Face of Higher Education in Europe', *WENR/World Education News and Reviews* 14(2). Retrieved November 30, 2007, from: <http://www.wes.org/ewenr/01march/feature.htm>.

Sedgwick, R. (2003, September/October). 'The Bologna process: As seen from the outside', *WENR/World Education News and Reviews* 16(5). Retrieved November 30, 2007, from: <http://www.wes.org/ewenr/03Sept/Feature.htm>.

Sennett, R. (1998). *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*. New York, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Shaw, C. (1930). *The Jack-Roller*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, M. (1997). 'The State of Globalization: Towards a Theory of State Transformation', *Review of International Political Economy* 4(3): 497-513.

Sher, G. (2000). 'Why should We Care about Russian Science?', *Science* 289: 389.

Shiner, L. (1982). 'Reading Foucault: Anti-Method and the Genealogy of Power-Knowledge', *History and Theory* 21(3): 382-98.

Shtromas, A. (1987). 'The Legal Position of Soviet Nationalities and their Territorial Units according to the 1977 Constitution of the USSR', *Russian Review* 37(3): 265-72.

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. Sage Publications.

Simpson, G., & Yinger, J. (1958). *Racial and Cultural Minorities: an Analysis of Prejudice and Discrimination*. New York, New York: Harper & Brothers.

Skelton, C. (2005, February). 'The "Self-Interested" Woman Academic: A Consideration of Beck's Model of the "Individualised Individual"', *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 26(1): 5-16.

- Slaughter, S., and Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Slezkine, Y. (2004). *The Jewish Century*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Smart, B. (2002). *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Smeby, J. C. and Trondal, J. (2005). 'Globalization or Europeanization? International Contact among University Staff', *Higher Education* 49: 449-66.
- Smith, A.D. (1991). *National Identity*, London: Penguin.
- Smith, A.D. (1999). *Myths and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Smolentseva, S. (2003). 'Challenges to the Russian Academic Profession', *Higher Education* 41: 390-423.
- Soyfer, V. (2001). 'The Consequences of Political Dictatorship for Russian Science', *Nature* 2: 723-9.
- Spybey, T. (1996). *Globalization and World Society*. London: Polity Press.
- Super, D., Crites, J., Hummel, R., Moser, H., Overstreet, P., and Warnath, C. (1965). *Vocational Development: A Framework for Research*. New York, NY: Teacher College, Columbia University.
- Tannock, W. (1995). 'Nostalgia Critique', *Cultural Studies* 9(3): 453-64.
- Thomas, W. and Znaniecki, F. (1920). *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. New York, NY: Alfred & Knopf.
- Thrasher, F. (1929). *The Gang*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Todorov, T. et al. (1997). 'The Genealogy of the Intellectual since the French Enlightenment', *PMLA* (1295): 1121-8.
- Toolan, M (2001). *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction* (2nd Edition). London: Routledge.
- UBuff – SUNY/University at Buffalo and The State University of New York. (2002). 'The Russian Federation: The International Comparative Higher Education Finance and Accessibility Project' [On-line]. Retrieved October 17, 2004 from: http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/inthigheredfinance/region_europe_Russia.html

Van Zanten, A. (2006). 'Competition and Interaction between Research Knowledge and State Knowledge in Policy Steering in France: National Trends and Recent Effects of Decentralization and Globalization', in J.Ozga, T.Seddon and T.Popkewitz *Education Research and Policy: Steering the Knowledge-Based Economy. World Yearbook of Education 2006*. London and New York: Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group, 259-269.

Venturelli-Christensen, P. (2005). 'Until Further Notice: Post-Modernity and Socio-Territorial Belonging', *International Review of Sociology* 15(3): 547-61.

Vucinich, A. (1982). 'Soviet Marxism and the History of Science', *Russian Review* 41(3): 477-93.

Vysotsky, V. (1964). *Song of an Anti-Semite* (Translated by B. Gendeleev). Retrieved May 20th, 2006 from the World Wide Web:
http://www.kulichki.ru/vv/eng/songs/gendeleev.html#song_of_an_antisemite.

UNESCO (1992). 'Higher `Education at the Crossroads: New Challenges and New Hopes for International Co-operation', *UNESCO*, November 2.

Wallach, J. (2006). 'Building a Bridge of Words: The Literary Autobiography as Historical Course Material', *Biography* 29(3): 446-61.

Waters, M. (1990). *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley, USA: University of California Press.

Webb, J., Schirato, T., and Danaher, G. (2002). *Understanding Bourdieu*. London: Sage Publications.

Weiland, S. (1994). 'Writing the Academic life: Faculty Careers in Narrative Perspective', *The Review of Higher Education* 17(4): 395-422.

Weiland, S. (1995). 'Life History and Academic Work: The Career of Professor G', in R.Josselson and A.Lieblich (Eds.) *The Narrative Study of Lives*, Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publications, 59-99.

Weiner, A. (2004). *Making Sense of War*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press.

Weinrod, A. and Levy, A. (2005). 'On Homelands and Diasporas: An Introduction', in A. Levy and A. Weinrod (Eds.) *Homelands and Diasporas*. Stanford University Press, 3-26.

Weinryb, B. (1966). 'A Note on Anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia (Post-Stalin Period)', *Slavic Review* 25(3): 523-527.

Weinryb, B. (1970). 'Anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia', in L. Kochan (Ed.) *The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 288-320.

Welch, A. and Zhen, Z. (2008). 'The Chinese Knowledge Diaspora: Communication Networks among Overseas Chinese Intellectuals in the Global Era', in D. Epstein, R. Boden, R. Deem, F. Rizvi and S. Wright (Eds.) *Geographies of Knowledge, Geometries of Power: Framing the Future of Higher Education (The World Yearbook of Education 2008)*, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis.

Wengraf, T. (2001). *Qualitative Research Interviewing: Biographic Narrative and Semi-Structured Methods*, London: Sage.

Went, R. (2000). *Globalization: Neoliberal Challenge, Radical Responses*. London: Pluto Press.

Westheimer, J. (2002). 'Tenure Denied: Union Busting and Anti-Intellectualism in the Corporate University', *Social Text* 73 (20/4): 47-64.

Whyte, W. (1955). *Street Corner Society* (2nd Edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Widdis, E. (1995). 'Russia as Space', in S. Franklin and E. Widdis (Eds.) *National Identity in Russian Culture: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 30-50.

Wirth, L (1928). *The Ghetto*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Zuyev, K. (1998). Russian Science in Peril [On-line]. Moscow Times, June 11. Retrieved May 26, 2005 from:
<http://www.prometeus.nsc.ru/science/scidig/june.ssi#1>

Appendix A: Translated transcript of interview with Slavik, who is M(Y) and F(Y)'s husband

-It is both illuminating and rather sad to investigate how the great Russian mathematical school is dying or, more precisely, is dissolving in the Western culture. It would be not so tragic since the mathematics (and the science in general) is universal and sub-national. However, many good Russian mathematical traditions (close and non formal contacts with students, the system of marking, organization of lectures, tutorials and exams, long mathematical seminars etc.) cannot be imported to other countries for different reasons, unfortunately, and, therefore, are disappearing, coming into oblivion. Now the situation with mathematics in Russia is very dramatic due to the lack of money and governmental attacks and reforms. At the same time, education in the West (especially, in the UK) is also in jeopardy under the impact of bureaucratization, formalization and the so-called "democratization" of universities.

The main point is why the strong mathematical school developed in the Moscow State University. It happened due to a unique non-formal, friendly, benevolent and stimulating atmosphere which was in the Mech-Mat Faculty (the Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics) in the 1960-70s. Professors, students and post-graduates mutually participated in different events. For example, the backpacked in *pokhods* and attended concerts together. Also professors invited students to their homes etc. I can recall more then 60 research seminars for professors and students, during or after which all seminar members participated in some joint extra-curricular activity (e.g. played football). I have an impression that it was one huge brotherhood. It gave me a lasting feeling of fraternity. Still communist leaders **succeeded** in destroying that remarkable and sacred academic community which had been out of the party's control for a long time.

Why did decide to become a mathematician? I was influenced by the charisma of our maths teacher. I graduated from a regular secondary school in Kiev. Unlike the recent situation in Russia and England, the educational traditions in the Soviet Union were very good. The educational system that we used to have and that is now being destroyed was really very efficient. It was based on certain traditions

and on a widespread respect for knowledge. Hard sciences in particular were estimated very highly. They were viewed as the top of scientific knowledge.

There were many underachievers and hooligans in my secondary school. However, the majority of my schoolmates knew that knowledge is a lighthouse whereas ignorance and laziness lead to the realm of darkness and stagnation. That societal perspective was always ingrained in every Soviet school despite the demographic characteristics of its students. Now the major problem in both Russia and England is that not only children but also their parents underestimate the importance to study and master knowledge. The major problem of the former and the latter is that both of them have lost a sincere interest in knowledge accumulation. Though modern student spend hours on the Internet there is no societal belief that it is good to be an educated, enlightened person. Though career opportunities were severely impeded by the Soviet regime, it was very prestigious to get good education from a good University and to become an enlightened person. Though career progression was not always dependent on the level of your qualification it was very desirable to receive as much knowledge as possible. In most cases, people did not think about where and how they would apply their knowledge: they simply enjoyed the process of obtaining it even despite the hardships.

I was lucky to have an amazing maths teacher. He was a very old man. Very accurate in scientific knowledge, he was enamoured with his subject. His infatuation with the knowledge quest was always acknowledged by and transferred to us. It was only him who instigated my interest in maths and my ardent desire to master it.

His accuracy was sometimes on the verge of absurdity, which was both funny and amazing [the interviewee laughs]. For example, this is the way he was explaining to us how to write the π -number, which looks very similar to a Russian letter. He told us that the number should have more crooked forms because the ancient Greeks wrote it on the sand and therefore, failed to draw a straight line [the interviewee laughs]. That was so funny. We have remembered it forever. Every time I'm in contact with an old classmate of mine during school reunions (though it happens once in a while) we like to joke, 'Do you remember how Greeks used to write the π -number?' Or if my classmates ask me what I am and I answer that I am a maths professor I hear, 'Well, of course, you know how to write the π -

number, don't you?' The π -number story has turned into a living legend because I used to say it to my Russian students, who later started to say it to their students.

We also had an absolutely amazing and an absolutely unique geometry textbook by Kiselev. Which was the book of many Soviet school generations. The Soviet decades and leaders, as well our teachers and head-teachers changed each other but the book had been irreplaceable [the interviewee laughs]. No one could outlive it [the interviewee laughs]. That textbook actually taught us to think critically as beginning mathematicians. It developed our comprehension by demonstrating how simple logical operations can mobilise you toward non-trivial results. Unfortunately, I cannot say the same about latest Russian or English books. I have an impression that geometry does not exist in the UK anymore, which is likely to happen in Russia too!

When I was a school kid, I was not head over ears in love with geometry: I found algebra much more attractive. Later, as a college student, I suddenly understood that those geometrical digressions about and demonstrations of how you could reach meaningful results using only two straight lines had become an inseparable and significant part of my overall education. If to compare maths with a living organism, the former is the brain, in which the left hemisphere (responsible for logic) is represented by algebra and the right hemisphere (controlling the sensual perception) is geometry. Geometry is beautiful. It absorbs the beauty of the world. You cannot define what beauty is, even if you see it around and recognise its effects. But geometry can show the organization of beauty. Our old textbook effectively combined such different processes as teaching algebra and teaching geometry. Amazing that all that happened to me within an ordinary school.

I became keen on hard sciences only as a 9th grader, which was rather late for vocational choice making I think. I must confess that at that age I was more fascinated by physics. Still in love with it, I have been trying to apply maths to theoretical physics. I was at the brink of applying to study physics when a maths student from the University started to intern in our school. He organised a maths club for us and delivered several lectures on various topics. Especially astonished by the information about odd numbers [speaks with passion; seems very excited], I made up my mind to study maths right after that lecture, which was the terminal decision.

By the way, I had been sent to primary school at the age of 8 in 1948, which was a little late because usually Soviet kids were sent to school at the age of 7. For some time I kept feeling a little confused about that.

If you ask me what my memories of those years are, I will probably find it hard to explain. Well, you know, I don't even know how to describe those times [he stammers and chooses words]...I was lucky to be a college student of the 1960s. I am the 1960s generation, a man from the 1960s. We were a very special generation. Unfortunately, there have been not many of us left by now.

It was a unique generation, differing very much from the others. In 1956 I was 16⁶⁵ when the 20th Congress of the Communist Party took place, the event that broke apart and tore into shreds the image of Stalin, first in secret and later officially. That was the beginning of the Thaw years.

What was happening in those days was very weird and obscure...[the interviewee laughs]...I felt as if I were walking through the dark forest. On the one hand, a considerable lack of choice made our life perception a sort of consistent. We all earned little though enough for surviving. You could make a career only if you became a communist party member and began to commit yourself to all that [chooses the word] shady enterprise. Many people made that choice although far not all of them wanted to be like that.

I don't know how to put it [keeps stammers]...there was no freedom of choice, even theoretically. There was no progression in a decent way that you could earn more money and recognition for having achieved something. Even if you got a salary increase, what could you buy on the additional money? Nothing: you could neither buy a flat or improve your living conditions. You had to queue up for years in order to get a flat [finds it hard to breathe because of anger] until the government decided to allocate it to you. No one knew how long it would take: 10, 20 or 30 years before your turn would come eventually. We kept for something that did not exist. We were slaves to our expectations and dubious ideas. What kept us waiting for our turn in line? It is hard to explain. We had no other choice.

You could not go abroad either [the interviewee laughs]. It was impossible to study social sciences and humanities on healthy grounds because they were all

soaked through with Marxism and Leninism and you were forced to reiterate senile phrases such as “the Great Lenin”, “the Great October Revolution” or other nightmarish and vomit causing nonsense. That is why, true intellectuals, those with a penchant to brainy work, became hard scientists and experienced much less pressure. You could not find a place devoid of pressure – you could only locate a territory where the pressure was a little less devastating. Of course, I used to hear that cybernetics was a servant of imperialism and other offensive verbiage but not as often as social science scholars did.

We, students of the 1960s, were the children of the Thaw, imbued with its revitalising spirit. Though the societal freedom was increased insufficiently and granted only in petite portions, we still appreciated it. It was like a glimpse of fresh air rushing into a stagnation soaked cellar. We knew it was just the beginning and kept waiting for further improvement. We were not picky as we did not demand immediate or global shifts. We were welcoming any kind of change, even that coming in small steps. I felt it had become more easy to breathe, especially, in the times of Khrushchev; though all that communist dementia was still going on; all those senile ideas such as growing corn behind the Polar Circle [the interviewee laughs]. Nevertheless, there was a moral uplift: we did believe in communism and in civil society creation. It was the time of great expectations, which had swept us entirely. I have a feeling that if our generation had been given a little bit more freedom and if a little bit more governmental promises had been kept, our society would have developed in a much better way. However, together with our fleeting youth [the interviewee laughs], the expectations and promises of the 1960s vanished into the thin air but never came into oblivion. How can one forget having been deceived and betrayed! We are the betrayed and deceived generation. We were morally chucked by the communist party when Brezhnev came to power.

I do not remember the exact day of the advent of Brezhnev’s reign. I cannot say when exactly it started. But I can say our lives changed. It was a monstrous time in terms of morale. Everything was regressing. The whole life was an eternal regression. People around were being turned into pigs, drunk, mean and lowered down.

Since the time the 1960s were buried, all other generations, including my children, had been grown up in a state of despair. No one believed in anything. People had zest in life. Nor did they know how to get it. Everything was so bleak and nonchalant. Still everyone kept murmuring the well rehearsed and learnt by heart anthems about communism. Everything was soaked through with lies. Everything was a fake, especially, the schooling system [speaks with hatred].

I graduated from a very ordinary school. Maybe we were stupid and naive but we trusted our teachers entirely. I could not even imagine myself disparaging a teacher's instruction. They were teaching us first of all though everything was soaked through with ideology. Of course, we used to have the early morning sessions of political information exchange every week. Those sessions known as "morning briefings" - *politinformatziya*. Every Monday we came to school by 7 a.m. and during an hour a designated student had to report to the whole class on a long pro-communist article from the newspaper *Pravda*, the most central and powerful publication in the Soviet Union. We all were murmuring something about communism. But it did not matter because no one understood a word said. We couldn't care less.

The post-Stalin and pre-Brezhnev ideology of the 1950s and 1960s did not murder us or our expectations. In that sense it was benign. It was not hazardous to the societal morale whereas the Brezhnev school or the school of my children was complete stagnation: neither quality of knowledge nor morale. [He is very anxious. He keeps stammering]. It is not easy for me to recall the Brezhnev epoch. It is hard to express your feelings when your expectations are being ruined in front of your eyes and when you see crystal clear that your children are being deprived of their future [His voice is trembling. He finds it hard to breathe and to resume control over his speech. He makes a very long pause and his sighs become calmer].

-What do you remember about the 1940s?

-Well, I was born in 1940, a year prior to the WW2, in Moscow. My father was working at a military plant in Moscow whereas my mother, my granny and I were evacuated to the East in 1942. In 1944 we came back to Moscow. Our family, including me, my parents and my granny, got a room in a communal flat for 13 families. We were sharing the flat, that was located in the heart of Moscow, very

close to the Red Square, with 12 other families. Our life there was very hard [the interviewee laughs]. Thanks goodness, it did not last for long. In 1946 we moved to Kiev, the Ukraine. My grandfather, who had divorced my granny, was a famous academician there. He helped my dad to get to the postgraduate school in Kiev.

My father was a mechanical engineer. Prior to arriving in Kiev, he was interested in the mechanics of explosion, working for the famous Lavrent'ev in Moscow. The latter was being engaged in the bomb design project. After having come to Kiev, my father became especially keen on how to create artificial diamonds, for example, carbon, that would cut any steel by mean of explosion.

My Mum was a scientist of geology, focusing on the age of paleontology. She had spent a lot of time on geological expeditions before she had started an academic career in Kiev, teaching geography and geology at the Polytechnic Institute.

Though everyone could speak Russian in Kiev, that place was very different from Russia [the interviewee laughs]. I felt like a stranger there. I was very lonely. At the age of 6 I was aware of only 2 existing languages: Russian and English. When we were to move to Kiev in 1946 I thought that everyone there must speak English because I knew that Kiev was not part of Russia I could say only 2 phrases in English: 'How do you do?' and 'Give me a candy' [the interviewee laughs very much]. In Kiev I did not hesitate to approach people in the street by saying, 'How do you do? Give me a candy' [the interviewee laughs very much]. I was surprised that very many people there spoke good Russian. Quite a few of Ukrainians did not love Russians.

My life...[the interviewee laughs]...suddenly changed because of one little dot. I forgot to "cross the t-s and to dot the i-s" [the interviewee laughs]. I often think that what would have happened to my life if there had not been that forgotten little dot? My life would probably have taken quite a different turn and I would not be here today.

I was applying to the Kiev State University and was denied admission there because I had underscored a little bit. On the maths test my former classmate, who was sitting behind, slightly punched my back with a ruler. He did not know the answer and wanted me to prompt him. I turned back to figure out what he wanted but

the teacher misunderstood my gesture of good will and communist solidarity :) and decided that I was cheating. The teacher simply ticked my answer sheet. As a result my grade was '3' ['C'].

The situation at the following oral maths exam was even more curious. I was to equate the sum of logarithms. The examination cards were hand typed (as there were no computers at all in those times) and the typist had failed to type the '+' sign, maybe because she had been in a hurry or maybe because the typing machine was malfunctioning. As a result, that equation was looking like the multiplication of logarithms, a task that cannot be solved at all. I was trying hard but nothing came. I told the teacher that the equation had no solution. Softly speaking, that teacher was a maths dummy. He said very obnoxiously, 'You are ineffectual and you do not understand mathematics. I could solve this equation before you could say Jack Robinson because it is as easy as pie!' having said this, he turned his back to me, nestled himself comfortably into the chair and went on watching us. Of course, he did not rush into solving that equation. As a result, I did not solve that equation either and got another '3'-grade. I knew that after two '3's I would hardly get a higher one on the following exam on physics. Nevertheless I got '5' ['A']. Initially, they had not wanted to give me an excellent grade. However, there were no grounds for knocking me down and they kept peppering me with new tasks. Having solved around 20 additional equations, I still managed to get '5'. My grade on the final exam in Russian composition was also excellent.

All in all I scored 16 from two '3's and two '5's. The passing score was 17. 16 was the semi-passing score, which meant that some people with the score of 16 would be accepted, some would not. Finally, the committee arrived at the wise, Solomon's, decision [the interviewee laughs]. They did not accept anyone with the score of 16. Instead they admitted those who had got '2' ['Fail'] on the entrance exams to the Agricultural Institute (those applicants were complete idiots). I don't know what place the committee members were thinking with, but they accepted all those idiots instead of us, slight under-scorers [the interviewee laughs].

But that was not the end of the story. I filed a written appeal and they really admitted that they had failed to type '+' and that without it the task had been unsolvable. Reluctant to confess their own stupidity, they made many efforts to turn

me down. However, I kept going through various departments and my complaints created a lot of noise and finally reached the principal. But it lasted for the whole summer. My parents were in the Crimea. I was doing everything on my own and did not tell them anything: I did not want to upset them.

Finally, I was called to the principal. He showed me my application form, which had been filled in Ukrainian because it was the splash of the Ukrainian nationalism. He showed my application form to me and said:

Look, you have spelt the word 'Kiev' with only 1 dot above whereas it must spell with two dots above. What are we talking about? If you cannot spell the word 'Kiev', what University are you thinking about? :) You are an illiterate villager, who deserves a place neither in mathematics nor in our homeland! People like you cast a shadow on our science!' It was the terminal decision.

You see now that I have fallen a victim to that little dot :) [he speaks very merrily, without any shade of offence in his voice]. But I was longing to study at the University. I had an aunt, a distant relative in Moscow, who was a porter at the faculty of MechMat, the Moscow State University. She invited me and gave me the entrance pass to the evening classes there. I was auditing them non-officially. If there could be such a thing as the Cathedral of Knowledge, that was the Moscow State University for me. I was entering it with a feeling of worship every time, as it I was coming into the Temple of Wisdom, the Temple of Science [he speaks with adoration and exultation]. It was a new building. My head was dancing with joy. I was feeling blissfully happy there. Those evening classes were the lighthouse for me, my knowledge dope...[the interviewee laughs]. I was feeling revived and so much alive! The idea of a possibility to simply go there, without any obstacles, to listen to lectures and to make notes gave me a sort of holy tremble over my body. It was intellectual revival for me.

I recall one of such classes, the one that has really changed my life. I was sitting at the back desk and was trying not to draw anyone's attention, when the teacher approached me suddenly and asked me to come up to the chalkboard. I thought that he had identified me as an illegal passenger in a bus and had decided to exile me from that little academic paradise. He was waiting for me at the chalkboard...[the interviewee laughs]...whereas I was gathering my belongings and

heading off past the board and toward the exit [the interviewee laughs]. I was walking as if through the fog because I could not restrain my flooding tears [the interviewee laughs]. I felt like my life was ending together with that lecture. I knew that I could not live if separated from that University. The teacher was clinging on me and pulling me to the chalkboard while the students were rolling in their chairs.

Later he told me that he had decided to give the initiative to me, a very shy student from miles up in the gods, because he had realised that I knew the answer. I will never forget the night when he was asking me to the chalkboard and was waiting for me to solve the equation. It was so pleasant. Immediately after that episode he officially recommended me to that evening programme. I got there without exams because there were many vacancies there. Having completed the first semester very successfully, I was transferred to the daytime cohort, from which many regular students had dropped out. The MechMat at the Moscow State University was the Promised Land for me. I felt chosen.

My bosom friend Boris' story is no less touchy. Having graduated from a very prestigious mathematical school in Moscow and having won maths Olympiads not once, he was knocked off at the entrance exams to the MechMat because he was a Jew. He got to the evening programme, where we met. Then we together transferred to the regular cohort. He was always helping me out both in Moscow and at the University. A booby from the province, I was completely flummoxed. That is why Boris was guiding me through everywhere. I was very happy to have such a good mentor. I admired him because in my mind's eye he was almost a man of genius. I wanted to be like him – at least, no worse [the interviewee laughs]. For me he was a good stimulus to grow intellectually. It was a sort of funny competition between us, a very benign and kind way of competing among close friends [the interviewee laughs].

We had absolutely unique teachers, for example, Mr.β. He gave us A-MA-ZING lectures on linear algebra. He is my academic granny: he was the advisor of my advisor. Mr.β was giving lectures to the first-year students. He also arranged seminars for us, where he usually told us about a new, emerging, domain in mathematics, for example, something from applied maths or theory of probability. After that he gave a series of tasks to solve on our own. If a student was keen in a

particular category of task, Mr.β directed him to his postgraduate. Again on Boris' initiative, we both got to Mr.β's postgraduate student Arnold Iceberg and began to study Leigh groups. Why Leigh? Even then Boris had a nose for information. He had a research instinct toward what is a promising area for mastering. He seemed to know what to do in science and in life whereas I was so naïve and childish. It was him who brought home to me the importance to go into Leigh groups. He assured me that it was a promising emerging direction in maths. This is how I was assigned to Iceberg – my lucky chance! [the interviewee laughs].

Once in a while Mr.β was hiking with us, first-year students, in the forest or in the park. During those walking tours we talked a lot about maths. Those walking hours were something that is now completely missing in the Western academic life. Unfortunately, Mr.β was fired from the University and he had to immigrate to the USA.

-What was he fired for?

-He used to have many enemies because he was a very good teacher. He was accused of breaking the Soviet morale and ideologically executed at the communist party meeting. To blame a talented academic person for the moral impurity was a very common phenomenon in the Brezhnev's epoch. Mr.β was not the only victim of Brezhnevism.

Mr.β's influence on my professional identity was very strong because his lectures on linear algebra were absolutely amazing. So were his seminars, on which he made reports on various topics. He knew so much! He was an absolutely unique teacher! Listening to his lectures, I thought that I wanted to be an academic person too.

I hear from a friend of mine who works together with Mr.β at *Princeford* that Mr.β misses one thing in America – socialization with his students. Mr.β's American life lacks all those hiking tours and seminars, which were organised on purely voluntary grounds. He misses this kind of teacher-student communication. It is a loss for him. He says that in America a teacher cannot afford to socialise with his students on the same level as we did in the Soviet Union. I understand what he means. On the surface it seems that there are no obstacles in the USA for such activities whereas in fact, it is impossible. A teacher may be misunderstood, accused of sexual harassment

and fired for that. This Western political correctness, which warns you to be double alert about what you say and how you look at students, is as absurd as the Soviet power.

Theoretically the main goal of communism was equality whereas the communist party policy was to make that idea absurd. It is amazing how they managed to distort a beautiful idea to such an extent. The same is happening in the UK: the idea of equality is being driven to absurdity. They say students are all equal; students and teachers are all equal yet students go first [The interviewee's voice becomes gloomy. He sounds very frustrated]. The students' interests and needs are more important than these of faculty. Our UK University is just a lunatic house! Here is an example of "communism in action", which is the glory of bureaucracy coupled with the absence of common sense. All faculty members received an e-mail, 'The student Council has decided and the learning Faculty has approved to prohibit marking students' papers that bear students' names because students' papers must be assessed anonymously!' This is not an examination and these are not final papers but merely routine-based home assignments! [He is frustrated, angry, almost screaming]. Imagine, I was lecturing for second-year students and there were only two persons in my course. Should I still assess their papers anonymously! Shall I close my eyes [His voice becomes angrier and angrier]? This is complete dementia [He shouts angrily]. No one understands here in England that education is based on personal contact and that grading is only part of such education. If there is no personal contact, why do they need me at all? Am I a bookcase or another piece of furniture? The horror of the Western system of education is that there are no oral exams in it. This is a result of the struggle for democracy. Teaching is not a game of billiards and people involved in the process of knowledge exchange are neither billiards balls nor cogs in a big wheel yet personalities. That is why, education mustn't be standardised or commodified. Education is a creative process!!! [He screams] When a picture by an artist is always subjective and very personal. It would be stupid to demand that all artists should draw the same. It would be absurd to demand complete objectivity from an artist. A University teacher is like an artist. Otherwise it doesn't make sense to teach at all. Knowledge acquisition and bringing up intellectuals are art, which mustn't be commodified or equalised.

In my opinion, it is the end of the world, the end of the intellectual world, when the market creates a sort of Orwell society, the Orwell-style-academy, where a theoretically beautiful idea of equality is driven to absurdity. This is the deadlock! It is also stupid that I cannot explain in plain words to the student that he has made a mistake. This political correctness is very well developed in England and especially in the USA.

English faculty members are completely devoid of power. Everything is controlled and squashed by the University administration [he speaks with anger]. English administrators are very diligent, unlike commonsensical clerks in Russia or Italy. English administrators try to work. The more they work, the more damage to intellectuals they bring forward. This is horrendous.

-What damage do they produce?

-Horrible damage! They are stealing out time. They are busy with nonsensical things such as students' rights or students' equality and do not think about the quality of the educational process at all. For example, they may seriously argue about the necessity to install the second door to a classroom in order to enable all students to enter simultaneously because all students have equal rights. These administrators are constantly giving birth to new ideas of bureaucratic accountability and control. The Leninist idea of communist accountability and control is flourishing there very much [the interviewee laughs]. The damage is colossal because it is the stolen time and quality. Like slaves to bureaucracy, academic faculty are handcuffed with bureaucratic instructions and report papers. I always feel that my movements are restricted by all this web of paper work. These academic managers are academic spiders. Instead of teaching and creating, we are constantly writing papers. Art and creativity cannot be commodified! University and knowledge are goods for commodity! All their programmes murder the teacher's personality and create benevolent conditions for the flourishing of bureaucracy, the way it was in the Soviet Union and the way it is happening now in England.

-How did your working career start?

-I was constantly attending Iceberg's seminars. I came to the postgraduate school straight from college. Having completed my PhD, I started job search and initially wanted to go to Novosibirsk. By then Lavrent'ev, my father's friend and former

employer, had created an academic city there. Lavrent'ev wanted both my father and me to work with him there. I had a romantic attitude toward going far away. Eager to see Siberia, I decided to benefit by my dad's connections. Having received the invitation from the academic city, I was already packing for the trip when I suddenly met my future wife Valya [he talks about F(Y)], who was a MechMat student, and got keen on staying in Moscow.

Job-hunting in Moscow, I came across a man who was affiliated to the Research Institute of Organic Chemicals, NIOPIK [the Russian abbreviation]. They were designing paste for pens. That man was a talented chemist and an amateur mathematician. Loving maths like mad, he had no mathematical education :) Of course, he knew several basic things about mathematics that are adjacent to chemistry but that knowledge was not enough to involve in serious mathematical research. Still he was obsessed with a mathematical equation. Without a mathematical background, he had been trying to solve a specific type of equation - differential equation with digressing argument It is a very specific type of equation in mathematics. I have absolutely no clue why he wanted to solve exactly that type of equation. He believed that the solution of that equation would explain any mystery of the whole universe. I was hired as his personal mathematician. Having power and money, he could afford such an intellectual to. Theoretically, I was a Senior Research Fellow at NIOPIK whereas my actual duties were to consult him in maths and develop his sand castle initiative of solving that equation [the interviewee laughs]. I had worked five years like this. Of course, it was senile to discuss mathematical issues with him. He asked me to forecast and to fancy various solutions of that equation – the solutions that could not exist [the interviewee laughs]. It was a very weird job from the point of view of common sense :) Yet he was a very nice person and I could spend a lot of time on studying maths for my own purposes. I had written many articles during those five years. Generally speaking, it was a very weird life, full of absurdity. That is why, what I did at NIOPIK was just a little part of that overall nonsense.

-What was weird about those years? What was that nonsense associated with?

-All people were staying upside down. That was absurd. The more talented the scientist, the more people punch you. If you had bright ideas, you became an outcast,

a black sheep in the Soviet family. For example, to publish an article, you should receive the expertise certificate. It was a number 1 obstacle for people doing serious research. Every University had Department 1, the Committee of State Safety or the KGB, and the Expertise Committee. Your scientific life was actually monitored through and by those two departments. When you wanted to publish, you had to fill in the questionnaire about the name of the article and many other questions. The main thing was to state that your article had nothing new, no inventions and nothing outstanding. You should declare that it was quite an ordinary piece of writing that would cause no one's interest. Otherwise, you would not get published. You would not be able to publish anything without the certificate of expertise that was issued by the Expertise Committee. Your questionnaire should be endorsed by all members of the Expertise Committee. There was a scheme of steps you should follow: (1) the Expertise Committee; (2) the triangle; and (3) Department 1 or KGB.

After the questionnaire had been approved by the expertise Committee, you should go through the triangle: the director or the principal; the trade union leader; and the secretary of the local communist party committee. Moreover, they might be totally ignorant of your domain. Yet those people were crucial in decision-making. Their signatures were important. That is why, everything centred around personal liaisons. Afterwards, your questionnaire was directed to the KGB.

The main obstacles were the principal and the communist party secretary. If either of them refused to sign your questionnaire, you were not able to publish. Once my article was merely knocked down. It cost me a lot of nerves and humiliation to talk that idiot, the principal who knew nothing about maths, into endorsing that sheet of paper. We all were walking along the razor edge: if you did not get along with the communist party secretary or the trade union leader, you would never publish anything along as you worked there. Changing a workplace was not easy and even if you did, the situation would be the same at another University. You would still have to kowtow. This is how many brilliant ideas were buried alive. Neither could you publish an article with a Western editor. It was prohibited. You could go to gaol [he speaks very calmly, without any emotions].

I think that mathematicians who wanted to study mathematics became researchers or teachers whereas those who did not want to deal with science but was

keen on money and power became University administrators. Having reached the top of the career ladder, they started to dictate their conditions to researcher and teachers.

-How did your career develop afterwards?

-I defended the Dr.Sc. degree in Novosibirsk because of the same Soviet power. My teacher and PhD advisor Arnold Iceverg, an outstanding mathematician, failed to defend the Dr.Sc. in Moscow. It was a very sad story. Living behind the iron curtain, people did not even accept the idea that somebody could write a response from abroad whereas Iceberg submitted an admiration response from the US to his Dr.Sc. thesis. It was a letter from a famous American mathematician and, of course, no one in Moscow welcomed that fact. Iceberg was naive to have shown it to the committee. To pass the Dr.Sc. defence one must get 2/3 pro-voices. At the defence Iceberg got one voice less and fail the board. Of course, he tried to pass it again and again and nothing came. It lasted for 10 years. The principal, a very nice person and a talented scientist, was fighting for Iceberg. That principal later died; I mean he was probably killed. Down with pneumonia, he was murdered at the Kremlin hospital because of his affiliation with the military research enterprise

To save Iceberg, the principal kept organizing meetings and gathering various responses. But even that did not help. The crux was one single man from the State Assessment Committee – Mr.Sharikov. His second wife was one of the Moscow crème de la crème and an ardent anti-Semite. To match the expectations of her circle, he kept implementing the anti-Jewry policy. Though Iceberg told everyone that he was from the Swedish people assimilated in Russia, Russian Swedish, Sharikov considered Iceberg a Jew, toward whom that henpecked hubby had only one attitude – to impede and squash! It was happening in the 1970s. Iceberg also wrote a fascinating textbook on mathematics, which was also impeded by Sharikov. Sharikov said that Iceberg was not enough patriotic and therefore did not deserve to be known as a textbook author.

-Where is Iceberg now?

-Still working between Moscow and the US, I am not sure where. But he is still full of energy and ideas, which nourish his disciples.

-How did you reach the Dr.Sc stage in your career?

-Iceberg was my PhD supervisor and I was said to be his disciple. The MechMat leaders kept repressing not only Iceberg but also his kindred spirits and former students. Since I never denied my friendship with and always expression my admiration of him, I was told in very plain words that I would never obtain the Dr.Sc. while in Moscow. That is why I defended my Dr.Sc in Novosibirsk. Unfortunately, Iceberg failed to defend his Dr.Sc. in Moscow. He received many positive responses on his Dr.Sc. thesis, which made his situation even worse: one cannot fight the city hall. Finally, Iceberg managed to become Dr.Sc. in Leningrad.

As Iceberg's disciple, I could not defend my Dr.Sc for a long time either. For that reason I was denied admission to the doctoral programme. I defended my Dr.Sc thesis in Novosibirsk as an independent research fellow but not as a doctoral student.

-How did you arrive at the decision to write your Dr.Sc? Could you please tell me more about it?

-Straight from that NIOPIK I came to teach at the Evening Pedagogical Institute. That institute was something like a community college. It offered only evening classes for mature students. The atmosphere there was – I don't even know a decent word to put it. I still find disgusting to recall that. There I suffered a lot from the power of rogues. There were some decent mathematicians in that organization. Still all of them were at the beck and call of those rogues, who were governing everything. The only benefit there was a small teaching load, which allowed me to spend more time on real science.

I did not like teaching there. In my opinion, teaching such weak students was both damage to and violence over mathematics. But after having taught in England [his voice is very gloomy], I believe that the weakest Soviet student is one head higher than the strongest student in Hull. I taught my Moscow students concrete things, simple yet viable things, for example, how to teach maths at school. I knew they needed and would implement that knowledge. Composed by good mathematicians, the whole programme made sense. The Soviet power was myopic in a way that squashing and murdering people, it did not aim to murder academic programmes. The Soviet leaders were not that smart. In that sense their damage was primitive. That is why, our science was alive whatever happened in the Soviet Union. So was the educational system.

On the contrary, westerners have managed to calculate that they shouldn't touch people and that much more effective results will be produced if to destroy programmes.

-Why the Soviet academic administrators made you so frustrated?

-The goal of those academic bandits was to commit as many personally disgusting things as possible. In Andropov's epoch, I was frequently invited to western conferences. However, every time to attend such a conference, I had to go through a long bureaucratic procedure, which was humiliating. Almost every time, the administration hid my official invitation and showed it to me only after the conference was over. Just petty hooliganism, academic truancy [the interviewee laughs].

Another dirty story: I had a colleague who married a Polish lady. In order to pay his lawful wife a short visit, he was forced to fill in plenty of papers and collect no less signatures. Moreover, absolutely every administrator and every clerk who had to endorse his papers did not hesitate to throw verbal mud at him, saying, 'Why did you marry a Polish lady? She must be a Jew! Were Russian women not good enough for you?' All this was so disgusting. Moreover, all this was constantly discussed at various communist party meetings. But this is not the end of the story. He also had to attend the Old Bolshevik Committee, which was a gang of completely senile idiots. Those 1917 communists were totally out of their senses. That was an academic decision-making caricature: imagine those eagles of revolution, those communist dinosaurs, those academic cabbage heads, those volcanoes of stupidity (as you see, my brains fail to scientifically categorise those academic jerks), who were disseminating dementia in all possible and impossible directions! I wish you had seen that very picture of dementia [he speaks with anger]. They did not even understand where Poland was. Yet coated in power, they were mocking at you. I still remember their ugly faces, the faces of senile idiots. Good stuff for Salvador Dahli's imagination.

Another thing was communist party meetings. That was quite a phenomenon of dementia [the interviewee sounds very gloomy]. I was never a communist. However, if I failed to attend such a meeting, there was a huge storm. That is why I had to attend those meetings and listen to all that nonsense and see the humiliation of

decent people. That was horrible, especially the feeling of helplessness because you knew you could not defend a good person without consequences. I wish I could say that I responded. I wish I could. I cannot forget the episode about my boss - our department head - at one of such meetings. My boss was a good mathematician and a nice person, though a little broken down. Once during such a meeting for the whole University (there were lots of people there) the principal, one of the KGB men, was listening to reports by all departments. That was a regular empty talk, as usual; all those windbags with their pompous speeches. Everyone got bored. Suddenly our principal decided to break that boredom and to display his power. While our department head was reporting on the demographics, the principal interrupted him and said in public, 'Stop pulling my leg with fairy-tales about your departmental achievements! You are no one without my support! I can put you on one of my palms and squash with the other! It is only up to me to decide whether you will be bogged down or raised!' That was so disgusting. Can you imagine that my boss, the department head and a respectable professor, was forced to listen to all that verbal mud with the mute patience of a dog, in the presence of everyone, including his employees [he speaks with anger]? It was not surprising that after that a sober person would leave the country as soon as he had such a chance. That was the Soviet power, naked and evident. How should I name it? Can there be a precise name for this? It was the Soviet power in action.

-Are you telling me about your own experiences or about the experiences of your colleagues?

-Both. It doesn't really matter. The Soviet power was cruel to every decent person.

-What was your motivation toward Dr.Sc? What did you need it for?

-I had been having a strong interest in maths since the age of 17. I never stopped researching in maths. That was everything for me: my little world; my mathematics; only my territory, where I was hiding, escaping from reality.

For a long time I was going through many financial hardships. After our twin girls had been born, there was no one around to help about the house or to baby-sit. My folks were far away, in Kiev. My father-in-law was killed right after our wedding. My mother-in-law was a full-timer though she sometimes helped us. In general, my wife and I were raising our kids on our own undergoing many hardships

because either laundry or ironing was manual, handmade, work and there were no such tools as Pampers. Oftentimes, there was no hot water as well. That is why we had to heat water up. It took me hours to queue up for groceries, in order to buy dairy products such milk or cottage cheese [speaks with anger and indignation]. For some time there was no cottage cheese in stock and we made it from milk at home ourselves, which was easy though time-consuming [his voice is sad]. My wife and I shared all household duties. I was mainly responsible for doing laundry and family shopping, things like staying in line for groceries, whereas my wife was looking after the kids. I just could not set the whole burden solely on her shoulders. That would have been unjust.

In addition, we were both full-timers. Though I always sought to plunge my mind solely into mathematics and my wife sympathised with my intentions, it was actually not easy. We arranged our schedules in a way that would allow one of us to stay with the children whereas the other could be off for work. Imagine my wife teaching and myself baby-sitting. After she had come back from work, she released me from my baby-sitting shift and by the twilight I had been able to go to the library, which was located at the other end of the city. After I had spent the whole day with the kids, who were very agile and naughty, working in the library in the evening was a very hard load for me. Still I managed to find many useful articles there. The problem was they were not to be taken home and there was no copy-machine. That is why I had to interrupt my work when the library was closed. I had to stop until the next time, until the next chance to flee from home, which would happen only god knew when. Because my intellectual work was very intermittent at those times, my productivity was consequently very low. Still I always tried to be in touch with my former course-fellows, who were joyriding in big science races, and thus I constantly fed up my steady interest in maths. That communication was a good stimulus for me to grow – it saved me from intellectual stagnation. Right now I have many more opportunities to realise my steady interest in maths whereas earlier everything was dependent on material conditions and circumstances.

I saw everything happening to Iceberg. I didn't feel like crawling into all that mud and socializing with all those nasty people. That was the reason why I was postponing my Dr. Sc thesis completion. Looking back on it, I had to complete it

much earlier. Please try to understand that under the Soviet regime my whole life was akin to a long Kafka-style play [The interviewee sounds gloomy].

The Andropov's reign brought in even much more absurdity. It was all permeating dementia. I mean his senile obsession with total communist discipline. He commanded that everyone, including University teachers, have an obligatory 8-hour working day. He couldn't care less that we, teachers, were to mark lots of students' tests at home, above the workload. He demanded that we spend 8 hours daily at the University. For example, I was scheduled to lecture for 4 hours every day. Where could I get the remaining 4 hours? That was the question [his voice is sad] to which the communist party committee at our University quickly found an answer. They arrived at the decision to allocate a special room where teachers could sit for the remaining four hours. Our faculty was assigned to the cellar, where, to be honest, people mustn't be at all because of the fire hazard and the anti-hygiene conditions such as a lack of fresh air. Yet for the communist party the fight for discipline was much more important than academic lives and health [his voice is sad] We sit there telling anecdotes and drinking tea instead of doing serious academic work. This is an example of the Soviet academic life.

-How did your life change after the Dr.Sc defence?

-Well, it wasn't one of the main events. Even as a Dr.Sc, I did not lead a dolce vita because I always abstained from voluntary pro-communist work.

I had not been promoted toward the Associate Professor position for a long time. Even as a PhD holder, I had been Senior Instructor at that Evening Institute. I became Associate Professor only after the Dr.Sc defence, which was lower than the level of that degree because a Dr.Sc person should be Professor.

-How did they explain their lack of desire to promote you toward Associate professor?

-They kept saying that I had not been ideologically ripe enough; not active enough as a communist builder; not loyal enough to the Soviet power.

-Did they say exactly like this?

-Yes, they did; exactly like this; in these plain words. If you abstained from voluntary pro-communist work, you could not apply for anything. I started to attend conferences in Germany. In order to attend each conference, I had to ask for the

recommendation that had to resume like this, “he is ideologically tested, morally steady and politically competent”. Moreover, the wording must be exactly like this cliché. Had they rearranged the succession of those phrases that would have been the end of your conference activities. You had to kowtow and serve those idiots for the sake of that piece of paper. So nasty...[his voice is gloomy]...Otherwise, forget about the conference. So humiliating...[the interviewee speaks with anger]...I was always reproached for abstaining from voluntary pro-communist work. They kept saying, ‘Your science is more important to you than communism building’. Finally, they talked me into some voluntary work under Gorbachev. I was designated Chair of the Sober Men Society at our University, as part of the Gorbachev’s anti-alcoholism campaign. My communism building duties consisted of collecting membership money – 10 kop. [=10 p] per annum. That was such a miserable amount that I always donated it from my own purse, which suddenly raised my societal status in the eye of the administration.

My case was that as soon as I had defended my Dr.Sc thesis the perestroika started, bringing in many expectations and a huge wave of optimism. Everyone started to believe that once the Soviet power had collapsed the normal life would emerge. We made an effort to organise an applied research centre, in order to write books and teach students and postgraduates independently. I moved out from the Evening Pedagogical Institute to that Centre. We were obsessed with quite a fashionable idea of economic conversion, which meant the conversion of our economy from the military race to peaceful applications. The design of a new economic platform demanded various mathematical calculations. New-born Russian businessmen got interested in our centre and began to donate us money. However, those were sand castles. For some time we were on the wave that rose after the Soviet power collapse. Soon everything started to decline very rapidly and we found ourselves in the deadlock. Officially I was the head of that centre. We had no salaries. We, employees of the centre, lived on the businessmen’s donations. I travelled abroad a lot, being here and there, in and out all the time. I could afford to spend several months per year in Vienna, at the Schlesinger Institute. After the fall of the iron curtain that institute decided to carry on a specific mission. That institute created the centre for the unification of scientists from the Western and Eastern

Europe. I am one of founders of that centre. I also often visit Italy. I come there every summer to give an intensive lecture course in advanced level mathematics.

-Did you have any postgraduate student in Russia?

-Yes, I did, though I had very few of them. I had a very talented postgraduate student at the Evening Institute. Unfortunately, there closed my postgraduate programme there very soon. That person had a very horny career path: he fitted into the emerging market relations with great difficulties. As a consultant, I non-officially supervised a couple of PhD people at the Moscow State University, where I had a part-time appointment as a lecturer. I am eager to have my own, official, postgraduate students. I also supervised a PhD student from Florence. Earlier in Moscow I did not have a chance to chair a PhD programme because of my limited access to the Moscow academic elite. Now I travel a lot and as an academic sojourn, I cannot afford to permanently supervise PhDs. I don't want to be a sporadic PhD supervisor. Otherwise it won't be fair toward the students because PhD work claims a lot of concentration from the advisor. This is my personal bias.

-How did you get to the Hull University?

-At one of the conferences, I was told by my German colleague about the Hull vacancy. As I was almost 60, I had doubts about the success of my application there. Strange as it may sound, I got there, which was very surprising [he laughs]. In Moscow I was Associate Professor whereas in Hull I was hired as Professor.

-For how long have you been in England?

-For 5 years.

-Who do you feel you are, a representative of what culture?

-In the Soviet Union, I felt like a black sheep; I stuck out like a sore thumb [he laughs]. I never felt Soviet. I can't stand the Soviet power and everything related to it; all that nightmare; all that dementia, which has destroyed many generations and has murdered so many minds; all that idiocy, which has injured our lives.

Of course, I am Russian. Yet I love Europe. I am, probably, European as well though Europeans are very different. I want to cite my academic granny Mr.β, 'Everything is good here in the West. Yet it is a great pity that I cannot have my Soviet students and my Soviet seminars here'. Of course, one can find new students and arrange seminars even here in the West. Yet it will not be the same as in the

Soviet Union [there a note of loss in his voice]. This is a loss for me. Everything was clear in Russia: the main enemy was the state and because many people fell victims to it, they tried to behave in a noble way and to come to each other's rescue. In England there are many remarkable people, especially in extreme circumstances. Like Russia, England is a very contradictory country. There are both many monstrous and nice things about Russia. The same can be said about England: It is rich in nobility yet also in bureaucracy. The English bureaucracy is not as atrocious, all devouring or blood thirsty as the Russian bureaucracy. Yet the English education is in jeopardy: it may die soon. One English professor said, 'To rescue our education from falling into the abyss, we must hire more foreign academics'. I am here to save England [he laughs].

-Did you find it hard to fit the mainstream of the English culture?

-Extremely hard, mostly because of all that bureaucratic idiocy in such great quantities. After the collapse of the Soviet power I started to think that its idiocy was unique and non-replicable. I was sure that I would never see that administrative senility again. I was profoundly shocked to see that complete nonsense in England, where the majority of academic staff are foreigners because the English educational system has a very weak reproductive power. The majority of academic staff here, in the UK, are German, Polish, Indian and Russian people, like myself [he laughs].

Appendix B: Translated transcript of interview with Valya, who is F(Y) and M(Y)'s wife

-I used to teach mathematics at the Institute of Chemical Engineering in Moscow and I have only five publications, which is not very impressive [speaks with frustration]. To begin with, I could share certain insights into the Soviet academic life. I know this academic cuisine quite well because both my husband and I and also my daughter have graduated from the same faculty, the Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics or MechMat at the Moscow State University. In addition, I know plenty of people who are still working there. I assume you might find it interesting.

When I was a student, girls constituted only 1/3 of the whole student body at MechMat. It was 1962. Now more than a half of this faculty is comprised of females.

-What caused such a change?

-In the Soviet times it was one of scarce places where you could fully realise your potential without delving into politics. People could do science their without touching politics or having squabbles. As a beautiful science, maths attracted many young people. There were also some remains of academic culture there. You could pursue at least some sort of career and earn something, though not much. For that career there was no pre-requisite of the Communist Party membership, unlike in other areas. If you did not aim to become a department head, you did not have to become a communist. In other words, MechMat was a relatively “clean” place and maths was a relatively “pure” academic domain, though everything in this life is relative, of course.

Nowadays most male graduates from this faculty find employment in banks. One third of my daughter's course-fellows bank employees. Moreover, they work there not as mathematicians but as analysts, which is different from what they were majoring in. Though the mathematical education allows them to fit the financial mainstream quite easily, it is not their original domain. Modern maths is loosing its people. It is being betrayed.

If to consider the generation of my husband Slavik [she talks about M(Y)], the majority of his course-mates have stayed in Russia. I am only 4 years younger than him and regarding my course-mates, almost half of them are employed abroad; whereas much more than 50% from the cohort of my daughter, born in 1968, have emigrated.

-Why does it happen?

-If you consider my daughter with her MechMat education, her salary was not enough to cover the minimal living rate. That is why, the most talented people start applying for jobs abroad. Most faculty members of our University, those who are older and those who did not manage to emigrate, are put on a contract, which means they work in 2 places at the same time: a semester in Moscow and another one abroad. The principal closes his eyes on it.

-What does it look like on paper?

-In most cases, people simply talk it over with the department head that they will read all the courses in semester 1. They spend the second semester abroad, which allows them to survive.

-In what sense?

-Survive physically, because the money they earn abroad is enough for the whole family to live on during the summer and the next term. Unfortunately, you cannot be absent for more than a half a year. Otherwise, you will be fired. That's the law! These academic fruit-pickers work on seasonal terms abroad, have some gains and return. The academic fruit-picking money is important for survival. Most of my friends are such academic fruit-pickers or academic mavericks. I call them 'academic *shabashniks*' [Russian]. I don't know what is the best name for this phenomenon. However, I must confess that not every academic can afford this 'seasonable employment' – the academic *shabash* [she speaks with bitterness and a note of offence]. It is allowed only to people with degrees such as PhD/Kandidat or Dr.Sc. If you have a degree, you find responsiveness and enjoy prestige both in Moscow and in the West.

-Where so they usually head off?

-If they decide to leave forever, they decide on the USA and Israel.

-Who usually leaves for Israel: only Jews or Russian as well?

-[Laughs very nervously]: It is hard to say who is who in Moscow academia. Just look, our faculty composition was 2/3 Jewish. In most cases, either the husband or the wife has this ethnicity. Now Israel is a very desirable place for Moscow academics [she laughs]. Sometimes non-Jewish academics go there. The thing is that it is hard to get a visa for entry there.

By the way, the ethno-national composition of our faculty has been changing very dramatically – a sort of sensitivity to various political flows. Funny that I said earlier that maths was above politics [she laughs]. In my undergraduate years, Jews were accepted to the University quite widely. And they did not complain. I had many Jewish friends [there is a strong note of contempt in her voice]. But when my daughter was a college student, there were very few Jews in her cohort and those Jews were the children of the staff member [her voice becomes happy]. There was a selection [speaks very calmly]: on the entrance exams they [Jewish applicants] were isolated in a separate group. It was a “high risk” group because the examination requirements for them were much higher than those for the rest of the applicants, which allowed to lower grades. By mistake my daughter was also assigned to that group. This ethno-national confusion happens frequently in our family. My father was German and my maiden surname was not Russian. I don’t know why everyone thinks I am a Jew. According to the passport, my father’s ethnicity was registered as Russian. He had nothing to conceal: he was just from the assimilated Russian Germans. When I was applying to the University, there were no objections. When my daughter was applying, she got exactly into that group and did not pass though she was very well prepared. She got there next year, at the second attempt. Slavik came to the principal, his former course-fellow, and the latter said, ‘Swear under the name of Lenin and the Communist Party that your wife is not a Jew and that her maiden surname was just a spelling mistake. Swear if you want your daughters to be admitted to our University’ [she laughs]. And my husband and I were both employed by that University as professors... What did my husband say to the principal? We had no choice: we wanted our girls to get higher education. This is absurd but finally the principal told Slavik, ‘Don’t worry. Now I see that your wife is not a Jew. It will not happen again’. And it did not happen the next time.

-You said that the entrance requirements for Jewish applicants had been inadequate. How did those guys manage to enter?

-Some did, if they were really capable. Knowledge is power and maths is above politics [she laughs]. Of course, the assignments were extra-hard. They were peppered with extra questions, especially on the oral exam. Some of them actually passed. But there were so few of those lucky people. Some capable kids did not apply to the MechMat from the very beginning. Slavik's advisor Dr. Arnold Iceberg is Swedish but everyone thought him Jewish. Iceberg's daughter decided not to apply to the MechMat because Dr. Iceberg was sure that she would get there. As a result, the young lady received higher education in applied mathematics at another institute though her father had been a reputable academician at the MechMat.

-Why did you decide to become a mathematician?

-I had two reasons. Firstly, my father was a mathematician [she laughs]. We have a very interesting family: Slavik's brother and sister are mathematicians; my father was a mathematician and my sister is a physicist. So we are all hard scientists:) My father was a famous professor of mathematics at the Moscow State University. He published several books. From his stories, I even know the ancient history of the MechMat [she laughs].

-How did the ancient MechMat differ from that of your undergraduate years?

-The offered much fewer spaces for applicants. Our cohort was 250 people whereas my father's counted only 25. He studied in the 1930-s and there was a severe selection process but the admission decisions were based not on ethnicity (Jews v. non-Jews, like in the 1960-s) but on class. You had to be a proletariat to get to the University. And because Jews were seldom from the working class, they were not generally admitted either. My father had no right to enter the University because he belonged to intelligentsia. Like many others (including the academician Keldysh, also from my Dad's cohort), my Dad first got to the evening classes and then transferred to the day programme. In the future, 2 people from his 25-student cohort became academicians and 6 persons became professors. But initially none of them got into the day programme. There were no ladies at all in the cohort.

To be honest, I wanted to study history. My father asked me to his office and said, 'Do you understand that you will have to tell lies all the time? Every single step

of yours will sin a lie. Do you understand what you will have to write in every single paper of yours whatever you do? Do you understand how challenging it will be for you to pass all the exams? Think about it!' I thought it over and agreed with him.

Regarding maths, I like it because of its accuracy and precision. It is a very straightforward science. I like it much more than physics because as a woman, I feel technology much worse. As a woman, I am not very keen on all those technical things. What I especially liked about maths was that every mathematical decision is perfect and no question is left unanswered or answered ambiguously. Whatever you do in maths, you will always find a precise answer, a perfect solution. I do not regret about my choice because firstly, I like teaching in technical institutions very much. I was a very good teacher [speaks very proudly]. Secondly, teaching maths greatly developed my logical thinking, which is very useful in everyday life, with the latter so stressful [she laughs]. At the moments of hardship or despair, I went to teach and noticed how my logic changed. That helped. Unfortunately, I do not hold PhD. I tried to complete the post-graduate programme. But after I had given birth to the 3d child, the post-graduate degree completion became burdensome [she laughs].

-Tell me more about your teaching activities.

-After graduation I started work at the Bauman Highest Technical Institution. I am not sure about the precise name: it changed so many times. It was the best technical University in our country, the Soviet Union. In my opinion, maths was taught really well there, though not as well as at the MechMat [she laughs]. Nevertheless, the requirements were no less serious or rigid, maths was studied in huge volumes and the students were very diligent. What ought to be mastered was controlled in a very rigid manner [speaks very firmly].

I joined the faculty of electrical equipment as a junior instructor. That faculty was mostly imbued with maths. I also taught at other faculties yet not as long.

- How were you getting along with your colleagues? How were you adapting?

-Our faculty team was very large. The department consisted of 78 members. By the time of my advent, there were 5 junior instructors, who accepted me very well. Regarding the others, I came across them so seldom. We have the following system. Maths was required on all faculties in huge quantities. Each student faculty was served by a certain group of teachers. We, youngsters, were in one team, serving one

faculty. We had such a warm little club. Our older colleagues treated us on peaceful terms, though at a distance. I had no problems with my colleagues there. We always had a very warm working environment and a very amiable department head. He always supported the academic youngsters and tried not to overload us with various organizational meetings [she laughs]. Since the department was plentiful, the room was always filled with people on the meeting day even if half of the members were absent :) The inter-collegiate relations were very friendly. Our department head tried not to get into the details. Everything was under the scrutiny of the secretary :) She was responsible for substitutions and schedule changes. We had traditional syllabi and lesson plans (composed long before us) about what should be studied at every lesson and what types of mathematical assignments should be given. That is why, almost no instructional planning was required. In the place where I worked afterwards, intensive instructional planning was a must. But all this was just copying the same old papers and it was such a waster of time because everyone wrote exactly what was written a year before. In other words, everything was fantastic on my first job place.

But then I quit the job for some time because I could not cope with the teaching load...[she laughs]...since I had 2 little kids. Some time later I came back to work yet at another place, the lab at the Institute of Statistics. Softly speaking, it was such a fly-by-night office, complete flotsam and jetsam, sloppy work :) Our boss had a very weird logic: he wanted to collect all technical tasks into a single database. I don't understand what for! Neither did anyone in our team. Let it be an unexplainable phenomenon of the Soviet regime [she laughs]. With that pursuit in mind, he sent us to various libraries for collecting all existing technical tasks. Finally that data collection became the deadlock: piles of paper were rubbished on his desk [she laughs]. We never generalised or compared those tasks. There was no analysis. We just kept collecting them. It was so boring [she laughs]. I escaped from there to the post-graduate school [she laughs]. My post-graduate programme was affiliated with the department of differential equations and mathematical modelling at the University of People's Friendship, named after Patris Lumumba.

-How did you find that programme?

-I knew several people there because they were former students of my father. My Dad had been the department head there...[she laughs nervously]...before his untimely death during an accident. Many of his former students were employed there. They actually suggested that I should apply. That University was a curious place: they used to say that an ideologically refined person must complete either the special courses for communist leadership or the University of People's Friendship [she laughs hysterically]. All graduates from that University were assigned to work abroad, to Africa, Latin America. The undergraduate students there were from undeveloped countries whereas the postgraduates were Soviet. I was unlucky not to have got a very strong advisor. Both married women [she laughs], we were sinking in our women's problems [She laughs very much and speaks without anger or frustration]. Having written several articles, I did not manage to defend my PhD thesis in time. Then I found a job at the Institute of Chemical Engineering and it became evident that I would not be able to finish and defend my PhD thesis [speaks very firmly in a very gloomy voice].

Regarding the inter-collegiate relations, some people there were absolutely amazing. The others were very keen on making dreadful things to each other[^]. For example, I got the teaching load of 30 h/w, which was madness. After that one of my older colleagues told me, 'Valya, you will break down in a couple of months! You will not hold it for a long time!' So it happened: I began feeling sick. The department head did not know what to do with those 30 h/w because he could not find anyone who would like to substitute me. As a result, he organised a meeting at which the department was to discuss my unacceptable behaviour, the fact of my illness. Because the secretary of the CPSU (communist party) committee was a decent guy, he said, 'Let's count how many hours she has already completed. They discovered that my yearly workload had already been 1.5 over, which automatically cancelled the legitimacy of the question. I was freed from all classes except one group [she laughs]. The next day our department head was behaving as if nothing had happened, as if they hadn't thrown all that mud at me. My file was simply buried [she laughs] whereas before that he and some other people had kept saying that I was doing nothing.

After I had given birth to the 3^d child, I went on the maternity leave. After that I came to work not where I wanted to be but where I was able to be [she screams angrily]. The next in my route was the Institute of Civic Engineering. It was an institute for those who studied in the evening. It was very convenient for me because evenings were the most desirable working time for as time husband was working in the daytime. So during the day Slavik was at work and I remained at home with our children and in the evening we changed. The double-shift for both of us [she laughs]...Working there, I could grade lots of written tests thus fulfilling the required workload. Finally I had the 4th child [she laughs]. All in all I have 4 children: 2 twin girls and 2 boys.

-Could you tell me more about the people who were making your life unbearable at work?

-I would say that those were incompetent people [speaks very firmly], who either got to the top management or were serving the top management. There is actually no harm from competent teachers or true scientists. These are very good people to get along with whereas when someone wants to win some prestige among the top management he is ready for everything.

Our department head at the Institute of Chemical Engineering, the one who accused me of idleness, was just incompetent. When there was difficult material in the syllabus he said that he was busy and asked someone else to read that part of the course.

The department head at the Institute of Civic Engineering was no less incompetent. He wasn't even embarrassed by his ignorance. Of course, he said that he was busy at the time the most difficult stuff was to be read. But everybody knew that he never read that stuff. Once it was really absurd. He told me, 'Come to my lecture and if I make a mistake, correct me!' And he really made many mistakes but I did not know what to do. Should I tell him in front of his students that he was not right? I raised my hand and said, 'Mohammed Karim (he was an oriental man), you have made a mathematical typo'. He answered, 'No, I haven't my dear! There is no typo!' I insisted, 'Yes, you have, Mohammed Karim! This is not correct!!!' [voice is very decisive, ready for the battle]. In front of the students, he said to me, 'You know what, honey, go and finish this lecture yourself because I am very tired' [she laughs]

very much]. I was a junior instructor whereas he was the department head, professor. He was going to become a corresponding member of the Azeri Academy of Sciences. With all those honours, he was not even shy about his lack of knowledge! Amazing! [She laughs].

Then there was an initiative of information technology literacy for all staff members in the University. He, Mohammed Karim, was giving an introductory lecture. For 2 hours he was demonstrating a very simple operation. It was nonsense! What he did next was just ridiculous [She laughs and sounds indignant]. He asked me to come up to the chalkboard and said, 'She will finish the lecture because I am so tired and I have to go home. My wife is waiting for me' [She laughs]. Can you imagine that? [She laughs].

Well, those people were mostly communist party members. I cannot say that they were uneducated because their formal education was OK. Those were people who did not love scientific research. I would call them academic dummies :) However, alongside with them there were absolutely talented academics. For example, I can recall David, one of my colleagues from the Institute of Civic Engineering, who was an extraordinarily talented Jewish mathematician. He is in the United States now. He had a personal invitation for the World Mathematical Congress to make an hour presentation at the plenary session. Such a rarity! However, he needed the departmental recommendation in order to go there. Isn't it nonsense? Can you guess what our department head Mohammed Karim said at the departmental meeting? Mohammed Karim told David, 'We shall think whom to send there. We shall send only the most talented person and it may not be you!' [Her voice is mocking; she tries to imitate Said] I don't know why he was so rude? Was it David's Jewry or David's talent or all together that drove Said mad? I don't know. I can only guess. It happened in the early 1980-s, right before the Perestroika. Of course, a sober person will emigrate after that as soon as he has a chance! So did Jacob and I am very happy for him now because he's eventually got what he deserves.

-How would you define your career trajectory in terms of progression?

-I see no progression at all in my career. Nor do I perceive it as having integrity or consistency. I think I had no career as such. My employment history was marked

with **isolated patches** of work. Every new period was sequestered from the previous. Some periods were successful. For example, I have warm memories about my first working place, associated with really good students and colleagues. After I had given birth to the twins, the students came **to the hospital** to pay me a visit though I had taught them only for a year, which is not very long [speaks with pride].

No, I cannot say that my overall career was **a progression**. You know what kind impression I had had of my career by the advent of the perestroika? Not only my career but also **my whole life** had made me feel old and littered. Though I was only 40, my life perception was that of an old woman / who has not perspective / no stimulus/ to live further / I had a feeling that not only myself but also my children had no future and that everything my husband and I were doing was swimming **against the wild currents** / in an effort to give education to our children / and to bring them up as **educated** and enlightened people. / I had a feeling that we had been always swimming **against the currents**, / **failing to monitor our course**. I had developed a **paranoia** / that our tiny boat would **sink** one day / and that all my life had been in vain / **because** I could not defend my family / for which I had sacrificed **EVERYTHING**⁶⁶ [The interviewee makes a very long pause and breathes with difficulties.]

-What was the major obstacle in your navigation?

-Imagine the Soviet system of schooling with its extra-formalities commemoration ceremonies / when the school was at the top...[the interviewee makes a very long pause and breathes with difficulties]...depending on the artificiality with which the Lenin Commemoration Room was decorated but not on **students' achievements** / We, parents, were explained by teachers that it would nice if our children enter polytechnics instead of Universities / The school itself was praised for the high percentage of its graduates entering polytechnics. I have nothing against polytechnics. They may be desirable for some people, who may be really keen on manual work or who may be incapable of studying at the University level. I do not want to disparage polytechnics, but when everyone says how nice it is that your children should fail to graduate from high school with honours and to enter the University, it does not sound very **healthy**.

⁶⁶ ‘/’ means that the interviewee makes a pause and breathes heavily.

For example, my twin girls are partially deaf. The teacher often called me to her office and started to mock saying. 'Let your daughter (the one who has a mathematical talent) go to a polytechnic and become a typist'. **How can a partially deaf person be a typist'!** There is another example. In the 5th grade they had to learn a foreign language. Therefore, their grade was divided into 2 streams: one to study German and the other to study English. My daughters were assigned to different groups. I told the head-teacher, 'They **hear badly** / and I don't know German at all / Therefore, I will not be able to **help** my daughter to prepare her home tasks in German / **Please** / considering these **extreme circumstances** / assign them to one, English, group /' I was with a blank refusal, 'We shall not do anything because we never change our rules! Everyone is equal in our school! If your daughter does not achieve in German, let her go to a polytechnic or to a boarding school for deaf students. But as long as she is here, no one will make an exception for her!'

My misfortunate daughter was a very mathematician. The maths teacher deliberately lowered her grades in order to impede her transfer to the 9th grade¹. Slavik went to school to talk to the teacher, who was hiding from him because she knew he was a University instructor of maths. She was hiding from him to avoid explaining why she had lowered my daughter's grade with all correct answers in the test. I could have understood if my daughter had been given '4' instead of '5'. They could have said that the work was not neat and so on. But she was marked as '3'/ Later on she graduated from the **MechMat** *com laude*. Once she said to me, 'I am really grateful to our maths teacher for having given me a chance to quit that **damn school**'. She had transferred to another school, where she was a top student and the class leader.

Summing up, all those lies / that endless process of spinning lies / everyone knew that everything said at school and on TV is **an empty talk** / Already in the 1980s no one believed in anything. When we were young, we believed in something. Of course, we did not believe in the complete realization of the Khrushchev's programme and the communist society would be built. But we did believe in certain improvements. And we really had some of them. Some promises of amendment were kept; for example, peasants received passports and could travel to cities. My uncle, executed by Stalin, was post-mortem rehabilitated by the Khrushchev's government.

As a person, I felt inspired after the advent of perestroika. I had a feeling that my life was starting anew.

The political rebellion attempt took us aback when we were in the country. I told my husband, 'I feel like being **buried alive**'. I left the room where the TVset was on. I was not able to hear all that. Imagining that the Soviet regime could revitalise made me feel as if I were being **put alive into a coffin**. / Though after the USSR collapse there was another period of great expectations, they **did not come true**, unfortunately.

-What kept them from coming true?

-Because we transplanted **the worst** from the Western experience.

-What was the worst?

-Everything became commercialised, even things that **mustn't** be commercialised, for example, education. I left the Institute of Civic Engineering because I had been paid very little there and started teaching maths at school. I wasn't squeamish about school teaching because I had used to teach high school kids on the pre-college programmes. I knew I had a lot to offer them. But they were talking to me approximately like this, 'My Dad gives you the money and you must explain me your maths!' And they turned their backs to the chalkboard. They kept saying, 'You must dance here in front of me and entertain me because my dad is your sponsor!' So did their fathers use to tell us, 'We sponsor you and therefore, our kids must get excellent grades'. What they wanted was not knowledge but **grades**. The commercialization of education created the system in which people with monetary funds believe that they have comfortably provided themselves for: they want to have gains without pains. They believe they will get their diplomas and consider knowledge as garbage. It was very depressing for me. Sometimes I came across really good children among those crème de la crème slums. But in general, there were very many elite off-spring, who made my life unbearable. Finally my colleagues started to beat them with their own weapon by saying, 'Our miserable salaries allow us not to do anything [the interviewee laughs]. Whether your off-spring know the stuff or not does not bother us'. My youngest son's teachers used to say, 'We are not going to crack down because of your children: with our salaries we may not even come'.

The situation became even worse when he became a college student (it did not happen to my older children). Instructors purposefully lowered students' grades to keep them attending extra classes, which were already not free. It was like a circle: exam failure – paid extra class – then re-examination – next failure – next paid class – and so on. The slogan was, 'Let students pay at length'. When my youngest son was assigned to a specific department on the 3d year of his studies he said, 'Mom, finally they have started to treat us like colleagues, not like garbage'.

Treating students with respect was always present in the days of my undergraduate studies. But we were treated with respect from the very beginning. We were viewed by our teachers as their junior colleagues. What I want to say is education can not be grounded on the commercial base.

In the Soviet Union we had a remarkable educational system. I will not deny it was hard to learn. We were asked very severely to match the requirements. The training system was very rigid. I remember the day of our matriculation. We were blissfully happy. I remember the dean's speech on that day, 'Every 5th of will drop by the end of the year. Mind it!' he was right: by the end of the year every 5th of us had dropped the course'. It was a real selection: the survival of the intellectually fittest. They gave us 100 home tasks per week disregarding what was assigned in other subjects [speaks with passion]. There was a lot of mathematics, just the whole ocean of it [the interviewee laughs].

Though everything is breaking apart, the MechMat is still on the horseback because of the old staff crew. I must admit that the textbooks leave much to be desired. They are not as good as before. Thanks our principal the admission is still honest competition based. However, if it becomes commercialised, all good traditions will die. The oral examinations are more and more often substituted by written ones. I personally think the oral exam gives you a chance to assess the in-depth knowledge of your students and to evaluate whether the failure is legitimate or just circumstantial. Besides, the oral exam includes not 5-6 questions, like in the West, but 50-60 questions. Moreover, students do not know what examination card they will pull out. There is no other way than to master all 50-60 questions.

-Do you still teach?

-No, at the moment I do not teach at all [speaks very calmly]. After Slavik had got the position in England, I found it hard to find a job here. Maybe I could. But I was not confident in my English skills. Besides, I am neither professor nor senior lecturer. Having no titles, I would find it **hard** to apply for something here/ besides, my Slavik is a very big calibre mathematician. He travels a lot and wants me to accompany him all the time. This is so pleasant. What I want to say is when a professor wants to leave for some time he finds no obstacles at work. If you are not professor, your employer will not be very responsive. In my case, the absence of titles became **an obstacle** in my career.

Besides, after the 4th baby had been born and I had come back to work due to the tremendous lack of money, I started feeling as if I had already overworked and that it was more than enough [she laughs]. Can a woman still want to work after having given birth to and bringing up 4 children alongside with having worked all her life non-stop? That is why, I **quitted the job** for ever as soon as the finances started to allow that / Staying in that damn high school was so **disgusting** / Of course, I could have come back to the Institute of Civic Engineering and they would have been happy to offer me a job. But the salary would have been so tiny that it would have already made no sense. In a nutshell, the main reason of my retirement is the desire to be with my husband, who had been already travelling a lot. I did not want to be apart from him.

-Could you please tell me more about this vagabond like? Every time you approach a new culture. How do you see yourself in this new culture or in these new cultures?

-We have been to Austria, Italy and Germany for long enough - I mean 3 months everywhere and then again another 3 months and so on. I am mainstreamed with ease into these countries. Of course, each of them is so different. Italians are more easy going. In Germany we had good relationships with our neighbours and Slavik's colleagues, scientists from all over the world. We feel fine there. In Austria people are very friendly and amiable in the street. There he works in 2 places: at the International Research Institute and an Austrian University. His colleagues from the former institution are remarkable people: they are mostly the community of international scholars from various countries of Europe; and we feel very much at home there. At the latter institution he was already met at daggers drawn.

-Why?

-Because he is a foreigner! In Germany we are in a circle where everyone speaks English. That is why, we have developed strong relationship with a variety of people and I never felt isolated there. Language is power. But in Austria I don't know many people who speak English and I feel more isolated there. I don't like France. French people have impressed me as not very hospitable. And this is not only my opinion. Most of my Russian academic friends there complain about the French rudeness and indifference. Once when Slavik and I were talking in Russian, a young French woman deliberately stepped on my foot and did not apologise.

I have an ambivalent opinion about England. On the one hand, I really love English people and I have been always fascinated by the traditional English culture and literature [she laughs]. You know... the world of Charles Dickens and William Shakespeare [she laughs]. How can one not love it? I cannot forget one episode when Slavik and I were searching for a flat and could find the proper street. We asked a woman at the bus stop for directions. She did not know. But she kept shouting, 'Who knows this street?' She even missed her bus. She did not relax until she really found someone who knew and took his promise that he would see us off to that house [she laughs]. That was so touchy. Regarding this, I am just basking in the English politeness [she laughs]. Whichever office you come, people are always ready to help and they keep apologising all the time even if it is my mistake. I think we, Russians, have a lot to learn from Englishmen. Their everyday life is just remarkable. But the education at the University where Slavik works [she laughs]. I hope it is not the same throughout England. Maybe there are better Universities. It is not the University level of instruction and learning in my understanding. It is not a "pure" University, like our MechMat but rather something akin to a polytechnic where my daughter was recommended to go [she laughs].

-Who do you find yourself here in England: Russian, Soviet, or European?

-Well, I do not consider myself Soviet though I know that some Soviet features have been ingrained in my personality and nothing can be done with it. Am I Russian? Yes, of course because we all have been brought up in the Russian culture. We are the children of the great Russian culture, which exists somewhere in a surrealistic space. It does not exist geographically. It is **extinct** in physical terms /. It is kind of

imagined now / but it real for me – I do perceive it in my heart. So do most of my Russian colleagues here. This mutual feeling allows us to call ourselves Russian. Am I Russian? Yes, Yes, Yes! In the light of our incessant travels I perceive myself as European too. I do not completely feel like an alien in either of these countries; though I understand that in places where I do not know the language I am still not part of their world. My awareness of English demerits is explained by our long-term residence in and consequently, more insightful knowledge of England. In fact, we have lived here more than anywhere else in the West – for 5 years. In other countries Slavik just reads a short course or advises his colleagues in their research. He had never taught there for long. My Slavik much prefers more open-minded students, who pepper him with questions, like in Italy. He finds himself out of plate with English students, who are generally very reserved. Feedback – this is what every teacher is looking for regardless of where he works. He needs a more sincere feedback from his students and when he does not get it he feel lost. But this is a purely Soviet, I would even say a more straightforward, understanding of the concept of feedback.

-How does it feel to be a woman in the men's world of mathematics?

-Very hard.

-What is specifically difficult about it?

-When you are a student this difference is not evident. We were just all students: boys and girls. I was one of very few Soviet ladies who managed to graduate from the MechMat. In the Soviet times, it was a purely male institution. Girls were not accepted. When I was a student I noticed that most guys were more capable to mathematics. They were brain. That gave me a stimulus to study hard to be on equal terms with them. That gave me an incentive to grow intellectually.

As soon as you start work there are two things. Firstly, the conservative attitude: on equal terms **men** are always preferred / Secondly, a woman, of course, has many household chores and family duties. When you are a mathematician you must live in the world of maths, which is a rather abstract world. You must have an abstract line of thinking. But having a husband and children, you cannot completely ostracise from this everyday world and plunge into the world of maths. What is constantly evolving in your head is you what to feed your family on and how to treat

your child's cough, which far from the mathematical agenda [the interviewee laughs]. While male mathematicians cannot switch their attention from maths to their families, females on the contrary find it extremely hard to transcend fully into that abstract world of mathematical logic. I have a bunch of good female friends, from my course-fellow, who have had quite a success in maths. However, two of them have died from cancer whereas another one, professor, had got into hospital with neurosis, a nervous breakdown. Women's reaction to professional competition and career promotion is more nervous. The family also takes a huge amount of time, especially the way it was in the Soviet Union, when you had to queue up for hours in order to buy a bottle of milk. In other words, we, women, cannot fully concentrate on maths because we are constantly disturbed by plenty of things other than mathematics.

APPENDIX C: ETHNO-DRAMA 'VOICES FROM THE CYCLOPS' CAVE'⁶⁷

...We came to the land of the lawless and inhuman Cyclopes...They have no laws nor assemblies of the people, but live in caves on the tops of high mountains; each is lord and master in his family, and they take no account of their neighbours...I want to see if they are uncivilised savages, or a hospitable and humane race... This was the abode of a huge monster... He was a horrid creature, not like a human being at all, but resembling rather some crag that stands out boldly against the sky on the top of a high mountain... When he came... he rolled a huge stone to the mouth of the cave- so huge that two and twenty strong four-wheeled wagons would not be enough to draw it from its place against the doorway...

(Homer, *The Odyssey*, Book IX)


List of characters

<i>Narrator:</i>	Lecturer at a US University; half Jewish-half Russian; age 'D' ⁶⁸ ; left Russia in 1978 ⁶⁹
<i>Interviewer:</i>	Researcher (myself)
<i>M(Z):</i>	Reader at a small UK University; Jewish; age 'B'
<i>M(Q) :</i>	Senior Research/Group Leader at a UK University; Jewish; age 'C'

⁶⁷ The protagonist of James Joyce's *Ulysses* Leopold Bloom, an Irish Jew, wanders into a pub, where he confronts a group of anti-Semites. In *Ulysses* the latter are parallel to the *Cyclops*, a tribe of one-eyed giants, the most famous of the villains from *The Odyssey* by Homer (8000 B.C.). According to Joyce, who uses the images of the Cyclops as a metaphor for anti-Semitism, the Cyclops' blindness is mostly intellectual rather than physical. Chief among the pub scene Cyclops is the person called Citizen although the other characters also participate in the anti-Semitic conversation.

⁶⁸ In terms of age, the participants are divided into the following categories; 'A' – age 30-39; 'B' – 40-49; 'C' – 50-59; and 'D' – 60-65.

⁶⁹ Except the narrator and M(E), the participants left Russia in 1991-1995.

<i>M(G):</i>	Professor at a US University; half Jewish-half Russian; age 'D'
<i>M(J):</i>	Professor at a US University; Jewish; age 'D'
<i>M(B):</i>	Assistant Professor at a US University; half Jewish-half Russian; age 'B'
<i>M(X):</i>	Professor at a Canadian university; Jewish; age 'B'
<i>M(O):</i> 	Lecturer at a UK University; Russian anti-Semite; age 'A'
<i>M(S):</i>	Professor at a US University, Russian; age 'D'
<i>M(E):</i>	Reader at a UK University; Russian; age 'C'; left Russia in the late 1980s
<i>F(Z):</i>	Reader at a small UK University; Jewish; age 'B'
<i>F(D):</i>	Lecturer at a US University; non-Jewish ethnic minority in Russia; age 'B'
<i>F(E):</i>	Contract researcher at a US University; Jewish; age 'B'
<i>M(Y):</i>	Professor at a UK University; Russian; age 'D'
<i>F(Y):</i>	M(Y)'s wife and former University instructor; now housewife and M(Y)'s personal secretary; Russian; age 'D' left Russia in the 1990s together with her husband
<i>Bloom:</i>	Leopold Bloom, protagonist from James Joyce' novel "Ulysses" (the novel text is cited)
<i>Cyclops:</i>	collective image of anti-Semite (including Citizen and the other anti-Semites) from James Joyce's novel "Ulysses", Chapter 12 "Cyclops" (the novel text is cited)
<i>Connor:</i>	Walker Connor, American sociologist of nationalism studies and author of "Beyond the reason: The nature of ethno-national bond".

<i>Kimel:</i>	Alexander Kimel, Israeli writer and Holocaust survivor
<i>Vysotsky:</i>	Vladimir Vysotsky; Soviet bard and author of 'The Song of an Anti-Semite', written in 1964 and translated into English by Boris Gendelev (the text from the song is cited)
<i>Hitler:</i>	Adolf Hitler, as cited in Kimel (2002)
<i>Goring:</i>	Herman Goring, from the Nazi Germany

Act I: Entering the Cave

There is actually no safe place to hide.
(Informant F(Z))

My maiden surname was officially Russian because I had taken that of my mother when I was 9 years old. My mother was Russian and my father *Aaron* was a Jew with a typical Jewish surname. When everyone was scared by The Doctors' Plot and The Jewish Project by Stalin in 1952 my parents were persuaded to change my surname into that of my Mom. My Dad was scared to death that we all would be imprisoned and decided to transfer me to my Mom's surname. But it did not save me from being recognised as a Jew! ...

M(J): You know...it is all my wrong ethnicity...[He laughs and coughs nervously and fastens his speech].

M(Z): In the Soviet Union they always made it clear what your ethnicity was [He grins sadly and swallows air].

F(Z): You would never stop being a Jew in the Soviet Union...

... it did not save me from being recognised as a Jew! Not at all! There were several situations when my Jewish middle name '*Aaronovna*' let me down despite my purely Russian last name.

After graduation I was recommended by my former instructor to apply for a job as faculty member at the Moscow State University. Unfortunately our Dean was

an absolute anti-Semite. Our graduation fell to very unfortunate years. 1967 brought in the first wave of anti-Semite war and the consequent emigration of Jews. The atmosphere was very unpleasant. You could feel the absolute anti-Semitism in the air, the bare anti-Semitism in its ugly configurations. The Dean plainly said in a very cynic manner to the department head, who was **pro me**, that with my middle name, the department would exceed the limits of the statistically allowed demographic norm. My middle name 'Aaronovna' made it clear for everyone that **I was a Jew...**

M(Q): [hiding his face behind his cup of coffee]: ...hardly anyone suspected that I was a Jew because of my non-Jewish appearance and my atypically Jewish surname. But there are people on whose foreheads their Jewry is just stamped. That is why neither their childhood nor their youth was envy evoking. I have a buddy here [he mentions the name of M(Z)]...He complains a lot about having been badly trodden on...

M(Z): In the Soviet Union they **always** made it clear what your ethnicity was...Everyone knew that there might be problems because of my ethnicity. [He speaks very nervously and quickly and evidently avoids the word "Jew"].

...My middle name 'Aaronovna' made it clear for everyone that **I was a Jew.**

M(J): *Wrong surname...wrong ethnicity...weird ethnicity...*

...**I was a Jew.** Thus my access to the academic profession was firmly denied by the Dean...

F(Z): ...at college I was dreaming about an academic career, the career of scholar. But it was a sand castle...It was impossible for me because I was a Jew and by the 1980s it had become unrealistic for a person with a **wrong number five answer** to get a job at an academic institution.

...Thus my access to the academic profession was firmly denied by the Dean...I had nothing else to do than to seek employment at a fly-by-night agency ... I had worked on that job for 1.5 years before I started teaching at the University...

- F(Z): All my misfortunes were due to my Soviet Jewry. Entering the Soviet Academy of Sciences, I was first accepted as a temporary employee. I was fired and hired again every three months. They could not offer me a permanent position only because on my Jewry. That was the only reason...I had nothing else to do than wrestling uneasy on temporary jobs and waiting for Mr.Chance☺
- M(Z): When I was graduating from the University, the Dean's office could not find a workplace for me. They did not know any place where I could be wanted because of my ethnicity...no postgraduate school and no lab wanted me as a student or as an employee. Finally I managed to get into a fly-by-night office. Having worked for 5 years in that iffy enterprise, I was fired.
- M(J); There were a couple of unpleasant things happening to my wife because of my wrong last name. Once the Head of the SAS Institute, my friend, by the way, told my wife, "It is a pity that your husband has **an unsuitable surname**. Otherwise I would hire you!" ...When my wife asked the principal why she was not given promotion, he said, "I have another "why"- question for you. Why did you marry a Jew? What was about him that we, Russian males, lack? You made your choice yourself long ago. Why to ask "why"? This is what the principal told my wife, who was his colleague.
- Cyclops: Pity about her...Or any other woman marries a half and half...Half and half I mean...A fellow that's neither fish nor flesh...Nor good red herring...That's what I mean...A pishogue...Circumcised!
- Hitler: The Jewish youth lies in wait for hours on end...spying on the unsuspecting German girl he plans to seduce...He wants to contaminate her blood and remove her from the bosom of her own people.

...In 1970 I started passing the entrance exams to the postgraduate school. And again the same old story was repeated. The department head and all the staff wanted me as a colleague very frankly...But when the administration, the Dean, didn't want someone to get to the postgraduate school, that undesirable person was peppered with irrelevant questions during the exam on **the History of the Communist Party**, with the final knock down. Though I new that subject almost by heart (we had passed it so many times during our undergraduate studies!), I was **frankly** being blocked up because the teachers had been given the command not to mark my answer as "A". Therefore, I got "B". The Dean told me that they did not admit people who had "B" on the History of the Communist Party. He said that the only chance for me to get to the postgraduate school was to study that course as extra-mural. My grades automatically granted me the admission to the extra-mural

module of postgraduate studies at the MSU. You know there is a proverb: "You can't fight the city hall! Against a jackhammer there is no resource!"

F(Z): Some say, "Fight!" Others say, "Reconcile yourself to your fate!" There are also parents who tell their children, "Leave the country!" It is easy to say, "Fight!" But how? This vile is undefeated ☹ Reconciliation? As if it were possible! Shall one flee? But where? As if it were as easy as pie! What we actually had was Catch-22: there was no way out.

I was recommended by my former tutor, a professor with the world-known name. It meant **NOTHING** to him. It was our **DEAN, ANTI-SEMITES**, who was delivering the policy of the Communist party **VERY CONSCIENCIOUSLY**, let us say, **STEP-BY-STEP**...that well-known coward **dared** to say it in plain words to an official figure, a top academic. He said it plainly to the department head! She [the department head] was a VIP in our University and the Soviet academic world. To say so cynically!

M(Z): A famous professor and the vice principal were pro me. But the Principal and the Head of the First Department [KGB] said no and closed the question.

M(Y): That was an academic decision-making caricature: imagine those eagles of revolution, those communist dinosaurs, those academic cabbage heads, those volcanoes of stupidity (as you see, my brains fail to scientifically categorise those academic jerks), who were disseminating dementia in all possible and impossible directions! I wish you had seen that very picture of dementia [he speaks with anger]. Yet coated in power, they were mocking at you. I still remember their ugly faces, the faces of senile idiots. Good stuff for Salvador Dali's imagination.

The Narrator laughs nervously:

...Isn't it funny that it happened to me **twice?** ...

M(Z): ...just a couple of times?...

M(Q): I have a buddy... [he mentions M(Z)'s nickname]...He complains a lot about having been badly trodden on. Those who knew something about Jewishness immediately recognised it in him.

Interviewer: **Who** were they?

M(Q): Those who made decisions on hiring and on University entrance.

Interviewer: How did they manage to guess Jewishness in your friend?

M(Q): From his face and from his surname. He has a typically Jewish appearance and a typically Jewish surname. Everything is always clear about him. His surname actually means...And many people knew that.

F(Z): I had been used to it...I had been turned down from many places for that reason.

... I have already shared with you just **one** episode of such a naked cynic reaction that would have seemed unimaginable to me before it actually took place. I had not been able to suppose that someone could say: "With her middle name, she does not fit the allowed demographic picture at your department". What he actually meant was: "There are a lot of Jews at your department as it is. Enough! We don't want another one!" And he made it crystal clear. And that was said by **the Dean, the dean of the faculty of humanities at a high rank school...**

F(Z): **...QUOTA...**

M(Z): **...QUOTA...**

M(X): **...QUOTA...**

F(Z): It was 1988 when the Head of the SAS Institute, who was an outstanding talented scholar in his domain, plainly said to the department head right in my presence, "The State Central Committee of Trade Unions does not allow us to hire more Jews because we have a special quote on them".

M(Z): I was face-to-face interviewed by the Vice Principal of the SAS Institute, a prospective place of my postgraduate affiliation. Then he had a talk with the Head of the First Department [the KGB] and the latter said **NO**...I remember that miserable expression on the faces of my referees, the eyes turned aside and all those behind-the-curtain whisper talks. Everyone knew that there might be problems because of my ethnicity. [He speaks very nervously and quickly and evidently avoids the word "Jew".] I can understand them. There was nothing cynic about that. Everybody just feared lest he should have trouble because of me.

M(Q): I was told about it very plainly by the laboratory head. She told me that having overreached the allowed quota, they were not to hire any more Jew. She said, "Our Jewish hiring plan has been over". It was her who suggested that I should officially get to another research institute within the SAS that was to have my employee records there, but to actually work with her. I agreed. It was the first such confrontation. I was actually engaged in one SAS institute while officially accepted by another SAS Institute because the director in the latter place was a Jew and all his employees were also Jews. Fighting for me, he eventually managed to get me and he created good working conditions for me. He always cared about his people in an absolutely charitable manner.

F(Z): In terms of that famous "number 5", ☺ the following once happened to me. After the college graduation I wanted to get to the Department of Social Sciences at the Lenin Library. Because I knew three foreign languages (I had been privately tutored in French and German for many years), my potential supervisor was very much keen on having me as an employee. We had already negotiated all details of my engagement when she, the department head, came to me and, turning into red spots and stuttering, murmured, "The head of the library does not hire Jews".

Interviewer: Could the administrator, for example, the department head or the faculty dean, say something like this?

M(B): In some cases, yes... Usually they did not say it so straightforwardly but always let you know that. It was impossible not to understand.

M(J): Oh, yes, they often call things their names. And this is **good**. If a professor hears from the employer that the former is denied promotion on the grounds of Jewry, the professor must be thankful because the latter lets him/her know what the actual reason for the ban is. And knowing that, you can actively plan your life searching for another place. I am very grateful to straightforward administrators because they leave me no false illusions. I am not trapped in a sand castle. I should know it because I have a wrong surname. I am a weird nation. You know what I mean, don't you [he coughs nervously]?

M(B): After all, what difference does it make how exactly they told her about it? Does she really think it would have different? The result would have been the same!

...Another absolutely crying incident took place almost at the same time, in June 1968. We were passing the qualifying examination on Scientific Communism. Well, of course, it was **complete senility**! Idiocy! In fact, what kind of discipline it was! ...The main requirement for the entrance to the daytime postgraduate school at any humanitarian faculty was to have "A" on both the final undergraduate and the

entrance postgraduate exam on Scientific Communism. It was said that if you were not enough ideologically moulded, you did not deserve a place among the Soviet professorate ☺. All those exams were passed orally, not without prejudice of assessment, of course. I had a bosom friend...He was an incredibly talented and lettered person...So we were passing the qualifying exam on Scientific Communism in front of the State Examination Board. The Chair of that committee was the head of the Foreign Literature Department, a famous person, an absolute anti-Semite and cynic...

Interviewer: Why does she call them cynic all the time?

...He **dared to tell** our teacher of the Communist Party History to give me "B"...

M(B): In those years the MSU was...an intellectual Mecca of anti-Semites. Yes, they were cynics. They could easily tell anti-Semite humoresques at lectures.

Interviewer: Were they really that cynical?

M(Q): Yes, they were. 'Cynics' is the right word. I would say they had very primitive emotions about Jews.

...That friend of mine got 'B'. He could not understand why...he had a memory tenacious to such an extent that no one could confuse him with any question. After the exam he asked the chair in the hall: 'Excuse me, Sir, would you please explain to me why I have got 'B'?' And we all were standing around and listening. Looking strait into the guy's eyes, the chair said very calmly, 'Why are you asking? You should know yourself why'. And my friend [*her voice is trembling*]... I still see his face: he got absolutely pale; his face became absolutely white. We all started to press his hands from both sides not to let him lose self-control. We understood that you shouldn't burn the bridges because we were all defenceless in that cruel world. We feared lest he should say something to or even slap that anti-Semite. Because had he done something like that (and he actually

could), he would have been exiled somewhere to a far-remote place, with his entire life ruined.

It was 1968, right half a year after the first anti-Semite wave. [*Speaks with great passion*]: The faculty of humanities was imbued with that atmosphere of hatred. Studying or working there you could perceive it **especially sharply**. Now it may sound as unbelievable as a nightmare but it was our **REALITY! OUR EVERYDAY ROUTINE!** In the late 60-s there were just single cases of Jewish emigration. In 1972-75 many of my friends emigrated. And 1978 was marked with a huge stream of Jewish emigrants from the Soviet Union. 100 people per week arrived in Chicago in 1979. Can you imagine it?

In 1967 the faculty of humanities was an absolute retrograde. You can see that the two mighty persons, the dean and the head of the foreign literature department, monitored all that communist politics at our faculty. Of course, that friend of mine was not able to enter the postgraduate school and got a stupid clerical job in the Moscow Library of Foreign Languages instead.

Interviewer: Did the anti-Semitism destroy the careers of many people?

M(X): Yes, it did. **Many** people fell victims to it.

Interviewer: To what extent was the impact devastating?

M(X): **Cardinally** devastating! Think about the fact that many people did not get to the University, did not graduate from it and did not become mathematicians. They could have become very good mathematicians. It was the societal damage. The science, **undoubtedly**, has lost many bright minds.

M(O):
† Let those Jewish boys and girls go and work as proletariat. Though it will not solve the problem: they still will get into the University sooner or later because most of them are really capable.

...Well, you know...[*she is very perplexed, still decides to talk*]...it had happened to me many times before but not like that! There was a lot of everyday dirt on the level of verbal offence. But I never paid attention to it. The most striking for me were those two episodes, with me and with him, when **totally official people of the top rank** [*speaks with passion*] declared that...**Just-i-ma-gine!!!** He dared

to tell our teacher of the Communist Party History to give me “B”, which would make me unfit for the daytime programme!

M(X): It was always such a **banal scenario**. In my case, it was just a **dirty fake**. Instead of promoting me to the Junior Researcher position, they accused me of stealing experimental equipment, which was a fake. Everyone knew I was an honest person and everyone kept sympathizing with me in private. However, the matter was likely to be taken into court and, though I knew that I would be eventually clean because there was no evidence of my fraud, I decided to abandon that job on my own initiative because all that was so **dirty** and I began feeling so **dirty** and did not want to sink more in that muddy quagmire. It is irksome to think that they were using such **dirty methods** of academic cleansing.

M(S): He was my teacher, mentor, PhD supervisor, employer and closest friend. He gave us everything: knowledge, career, self-confidence; and never asked for anything in return... They [the University administration and the Communist Party] accused him of being homosexual, fabricated evidence, made a spectacular tribunal behind the closed doors, to which he was not allowed, and fired him...They did not have anything personal against him, though maybe it was a sort of envy to a talented person (he is in a very prestigious school from the Ivy League now, by the way) – it was just another anti-Jewish campaign, the early 1970s, Brezhnev’s era. This is how we were building socialism [the speaker laughs nervously and coughs]...Oh yes, they had chosen the right strategy to get rid of him. It was more than enough to spoil his career because **it was not a good idea to be a gay person or a Jew in the Soviet Union and** [the speaker laughs nervously and coughs] **it was far worse to be BOTH.**

...Anti-Semitism has always been in Russia though in hibernation at times. In the 1960-s it woke up. No single talented person from my cohort got a job at our department after graduation because all capable people were Jewish. Only the brainless were recruited ☺. Like a sponge, the year 1968 was soaked through with that dirty atmosphere. And every negative reaction was displayed. It was like a splash of dirt and hatred. It affected people’s careers. Those who had credentials and deserved the entrance to postgraduate school with the consequent faculty position all got some insignificant jobs. When I was passing the entrance exams to the postgraduate school, the dean, remembered me. It was his command to mark my answer on the History of the Communist part as “B”. Otherwise it sounds absolutely

absurd! Later I was told: "Yes, he does remember very well **who you are**". The only thing that annoyed him was that **second, Jewish, half** in my ethnic background...

...The thing is that though sometimes comatose, anti-Semitism was never actually dead in the Soviet society. At certain times it was spread from above. My sister graduated from high school in 1952. Among her classmates were many brilliant mathematicians. But none of them got to the faculty of mechanics and mathematics at the University. They were simply **denied admission there**: Jews were not accepted! The same happened in the early 1970s. My neighbour was working at that faculty then. She said they had had a tremendous splash, **AN EXPLOSION**, of anti-Semitism, initiated from above. It was what is called "the anti-Semitism from above", because that line of thinking and behaving was implanted into people's minds at the Communist Party's command. The command from above was not to accept Jews to postgraduate school and generally not to give them any chances to advance. From below, anti-Semitism was always alive. On the other hand, it did not impact people's biographies as much as the policy from above did.

When I was 13 years old, my classmates were mostly from the absolutely anti-Jewish working class background, from the low orders. And they were teasing me all the time. Of course, it was very painful.

Connor: ...the sense of shared blood...the mass instinct...subconscious and emotional rather than conscious and rational in its inspiration (1993: 377-378)

...When I was walking home from school past the alehouse, there was almost always someone who shouted at me, 'Kike! Filthy Yid!' So what? What was I supposed to do with that? This is life. Of course, it was **very painful**.

Connor: The sense of kinship, which lies at the heart of national consciousness, helps to account for ugly manifestations of inhumanity (1993: 386).

M(G): One of my colleagues used to tell me how she was walking along the street hearing, 'Yidman walking! Look at her Kike nose: a huge nose is a mark of aristocracy', and the mocking chuckling, almost whisper-like, behind her back. She could not figure out if there were

her friends among the crowd. She was afraid to turn around to know the truth.

I think this everyday anti-Jewry will stand forever in Russia. But it never played an important role in people's lives because when you enter the University, postgraduate school, or the job market, the decision comes from official persons...

M(Q): I have never come across something like that because I **do not look like a Jew**. But in terms of politics, I could not get a job at a specific research institution for that reason.

M(G): Generally speaking, my academic life was decent enough. Had I tried to climb up the academic ladder, they would have turned me down, of course...My mother was a Jew, which was more than enough to criss-cross a great career. Of course, I would not have been allowed to the full-time professorship, or the department head position, or something higher [he speaks very nervously; he is frustrated]...I was not the only victim of those academic monsters.

Connor: ...the sense of shared blood...has been constantly apparent to nationalist leaders...they have not hesitated to appeal to it (p. 377).

Interviewer: Whom to blame? How would you explain such an inadequate attitude to Jews?

M(X): That inadequate attitude was constantly coming out from the University administration. It was not the everyday, the household level, Jew hatred that made such a policy line very crude. It was mostly the administrative decisions and you could do nothing about them. This is the way the world was operating in those days. We took it for granted...It was not the enmity of Russian people to non-Russians. It was the matter of politics.

M(Q): Of course, those who were running all that politics, including the party and the University administration, kept displaying personal, almost household, disgust to Jews. Of course, they were governed by the primitive, household, racism in their biases and administrative decisions.

Interviewer: How do you know it?

M(Q): Well, I came across such people sometimes, occasionally. And I heard various behind-the-curtain talks... I would say they had very primitive emotions toward Jews. But on the whole, if to take those people all together and if to sum up all their actions, what they had been doing was perceived as the state politics, as a sort of state-level force.

Interviewer: What did you feel?

M(Q): Well, at that moment I couldn't care less. I was absolutely indifferent to it. It happened to me for the first time. It happened so spontaneously that at that moment I did not manage to comprehend how tragic it was. I had never had identical problems before. That was so new to me...I try to think about it in a philosophical way...I think, "It's gone never to return. It's all over the hill now".

...Oh God! I could not believe that it had happened to me! Even the reminiscence makes me grow numb with cold. **I-di-o-cy! Se-ni-li-ty! No, it was de-men-ti-a!** This is the only way I can think about it! [*She almost screams*].

Interviewer: She probably wants to know why he did that to her.

Kimel: It was a subconscious need of finding scapegoats for his inner conflicts and frustrations...full of hatred and tensions, and this hatred had to find an outlet...deep psychological roots [Kimel speaks about Hitler]..

M(Q): ...the Jewish diaspora...fully blood-sucking the Soviet people; a drone fed up on the Soviet life. Those Jews have everything: they pursue education; make their off-spring study hard...you know, all those things like books, piano, foreign languages, smart conversations; those Jewish mothers never allow their kids to drink alcohol and hang around the streets. They teach them to study and to work hard. We, Russian people, are not so boring. We are more easy-going. We love fun and booze. I don't want my son to be like them, with all those manners and punctuality. I want him to be like me when he grows up: I am a simple guy.

Hitler: Gradually, I began to hate them (the Jews)...For me this was the time of the greatest spiritual upheaval I have ever had to go through, I had ceased to be a weak-kneed cosmopolitan and become an anti-Semite.

M(Q): ...**racism**...Otherwise, how to save the Russian culture?

Act II: Academic Darwin

Socialism is a society...in which: ethnic inequality is abolished, the juridical and factual equality, friendship and brotherhood of all peoples and nationalities are established.

A socialist society in the USSR has been essentially built.

(Programme of the Communist Party of The Soviet Union, 27th Congress, 1986)

M(O): In Moscow there came the inter-ethnic struggle: Russians v. Jews...there were many Jewish mathematical schools (such as school number 2), whose student body was mostly Jewish. Alongside with that, there were also anti-Semite schools for bringing up a Russian generation...The Russian group was more powerful...As a result, the access of Jewish children to some elite maths schools was impeded. I was lucky to catch that wave. I easily got to such a school, which almost automatically offered me the traditional route to the MechMat, because the tutors in that school had connections with the MechMat faculty. Cool, wasn't it! [He speaks very proudly.]

F(Y): There was a **SELECTION...**

M(X): ...**SELECTION...**

M(Z): ...**SELECTION...**

M(J): ...**AN UNSUITABLE SURNAME...**

F(Z): ...a special **QUOTE** on Jews

Narrator: ...he meant, **"Enough! We don't want ANOTHER JEW!!!"** ...

F(Y): ...the ethno-national composition of our faculty has been changing very dramatically – a sort of sensitivity to various political flows. Funny that I said earlier that maths was above politics. In my undergraduate years, Jews were accepted to the University quite widely. And they did not complain. I had many Jewish friends [there is a strong note of contempt in her voice]. But when my daughter was a college student, there were very few Jews in her cohort and those

Jews were the children of the staff member. There was a selection on the entrance exams they [Jewish applicants] were isolated in a separate group. It was a "high risk" group because the examination requirements for them were much higher than those for the rest of the applicants, which allowed to low grades. By mistake my daughter was also assigned to that group. This ethno-national confusion happens frequently in our family. My father was German and my maiden surname was not Russian. I don't know why everyone thinks I am a Jew.

Interviewer: You said that the entrance requirements for Jewish applicants had been inadequate. How did those guys manage to enter? How did people emerge through such difficulties?

F(Y): Some did, if they were really capable...the assignments were extra-hard. They were peppered with extra questions, especially on the oral exam. Some of them actually passed. But there were so few of those lucky people.

M(X): Some of them, who were fighters by nature, were sure they would break through eventually.

M(Z): It was **PANACHE** that saved me from despair because I kept thinking that I **still would be there**.

M(X): They kept attending special seminars and preparation classes... Actually hardly anyone survived that stressful path. Those who attended seminars broke down because it was very tough. If it was not part of the formal education, it was very tough. Those who survived that hardship were really unique exemplars.

M(Z): We all knew it and we all were ready for it.

M(X): The Jewish kids were told not once and they knew...they were psychologically ready for such difficulties. I graduated from mathematical school number 2. The majority of my classmates knew that. We were silent minorities and some of us grew up without acknowledging those facts unless confronted with the painful reality. Yet in the majority of cases most of use were *de facto* aware of our Jewry and we knew we were to live with it.

M(Z): Everyone knew. I was psychologically prepared for all that...My parents knew it, of course. All this was being constantly discussed in our family. They were very anxious about my future, especially my Mom, who was wrestling uneasy. The father kept saying, "That's fine! We shall search for various manoeuvres. We shall find a way

out"...I was lucky not to have been knocked out at the entrance college exams. Prior to them I had attended the preparatory classes. That programme was organised by Jewish rights advocates particularly for Jews with the purpose of explaining to them and coaching them in how to approach the "knock down" entrance tasks...As a result, it was a very close friend of our family who helped me to get to the Moscow State University (the MSU)... It was a mystery for no one that people of my ethnicity entered the University only via connections.

M(X): I managed to get to the University whereas many of my friends did not. I was applying to the Moscow State University in 1972, which was a very hard year. I got lucky not to have been knocked out at the entrance exam. I don't know why they spared me.

M(Z): In the 1980s career progression was an extremely complex and troublesome adventure for a Jew... depended on peculiar circumstances and demanded peculiar efforts.

Interviewer: *How did Jews still manage to make their careers?*

M(Z): Through their colleagues who often paved the road for the former. This is how my father got a job in the 1960s. But many of us picked up places that were less desirable in terms of career aspirations yet more tolerant to Jews and more favourable in terms of the working environment...We knew to which places we should apply and to which we shouldn't even think of applying...The majority of my friends purposefully targeted places where the admission was through honest competition only. Everyone could get there. For example, many of my friends studied mathematics at the Institute of Oil and Gas, which had a nickname "kerosinka" – almost "gas chamber"...Oh this wartime humour [There comes a grimace of pain on his face and his voice begins to crack.] There were even popular jokes in Moscow, for example, "All Jews are off to the Gas Chamber" ☹ ☺

F(Y): Some capable kids did not apply to the MechMat from the very beginning. My husband's advisor **Dr. Iceberg** is Swedish but everyone thought him Jewish because of that "**berg**"-ending. **Dr. Iceberg's** son decided not to apply to the MechMat because the former was sure that the latter would get there. The guy received higher education in applied mathematics at another institute though his father had been a reputable academician at the MechMat.

M(O): Let those Jewish boys and girls go and work as proletariat.

Narrator: The most disgusting in the whole story was the fact of **rejecting me as a person on the grounds of my ethnicity** rather than my professional characteristics.

M(O): Some may accuse us of racism but I will argue that the University follows the right policy line by banning their access to certain departments...Russia must belong to Russians.

Hitler: None but those of German blood may be members of the nation. No Jew, therefore, may be a member of the nation.

Act III: Thin Ice

Omnia mutantur, nihil interit (Latin).
Everything changes, nothing perishes.
(Ovidius, *Metamorphosis*)

I think had I not become the victim of anti-Semitism, my life could have taken quite a different turn. I totally admit that I wouldn't have emigrated. If I hadn't been denied a chance to enter the daytime postgraduate school, I would have defended my thesis very fast, with an immediate promotion toward Associate Professor. Of course, that job would have been extremely interesting. My energy and intellectual capacity would have been enough for pursuing the Doctor of Science degree and eventually getting the Professor position. At that time it was **highly prestigious** to be professor at the University. It would have been absolutely amazing, especially if to consider that my domain, linguistics, was the most "ideologically pure" compared with other areas!

M(X): ...many people...did not become mathematicians. They could have become very good mathematicians. It was the societal damage.

M(O): Russia must belong to Russians. Otherwise, how to save the Russian culture?...At least, some of us will benefit by higher education while they are left aside.

- M(Z): In the 1980s career progression was an extremely complex and troublesome adventure for a Jew. It depended on peculiar circumstances and demanded peculiar efforts. **That ice was always very thin.** The crash threat was always hanging in the air. It went without saying that you could be kicked off at any moment. Everybody knew that.
- M(S): ...it was not a good idea to be a Jew in the Soviet Union.
- Goring: **I would not wish to be a Jew in Germany.**
- M(Z): The Jewish problem was the most up-to-date. That category of people was associated with the social threat. They were always suspected of having emigration prospects.
- M(O): ...those Jews had everything...fully blood-sucking the Soviet people...
- Hitler: ...a people of robbers...
- Cyclops: A dark horse...a bloody dark horse.....all kinds of jerry-mandering, packed juries and swindling the taxes off of the Government and appointing consuls all over the world.
- Bloom: Mendelssohn was a Jew and Karl Marx and Mercadante and Spinoza.
- Cyclops: A wolf in sheep's clothing...Virag...Ahasuerus I call him...Defrauding widows and orphans.
- M(O): ...those Jewish mothers never allow their kids to drink alcohol and hang around the streets. They teach them to study and to work hard. ...a drone fed up on the Soviet life.
- Bloom: Persecution...all the history of the world is full of it. Perpetuating national hatred among nations.
- Cyclops: But do you know what a nation is?
- Bloom: A nation is the same people living in the same place.
- Hitler: No Jew...may be a member of the nation.
- Cyclops: What is your nation...?
- Bloom: I was born **here**...

- F(X): Russia will always remain in my heart as something intrinsic.
- M(X): I have not forgotten that I am originally from Russia. When I am asked where I am from, I answer, "I am from Russia". This is what they call us here, "Russians". Frankly speaking, I have been to so many places, that I feel more like a gipsy ☺ Yes, ☺ I think I am an academic gipsy, wandering from one institution to another around the world...
- Interviewer: Do you like it?
- M(X): No, I don't. I would prefer to have deep roots and to live close to my ancestors' tombs. This is the way a normal person should live. But it did not work out ☹ This is life ☹
- Bloom: I was born **here**...And I belong to a race too...that is hated and persecuted. Also now. This very moment. This very instant.
- Cyclops: Are you talking about the new Jerusalem?
- Bloom: I'm talking about injustice...
- M(X): I have been destined to become a maverick ☺, to lead the life of an intellectual vagabond ☹ Life on the road.
- M(O): **BLOOD SUCKING**...Jewish kids matched the requirements of mathematical schools in many more cases than Russian children. That is why there were many more Jews in Moscow mathematical schools...**A DRONE**...On the day of our 10th annual high school reunion I could not believe my eyes when I saw those former angel-looking Jewish boys, who had used to be my classmates, having turned into business sharks. Absolutely incredible! ...
- Bloom: Your god was a Jew like me.
- M(O): This is not fair that Jews are climbing up the academic staircase...We, Russian people...love fun and booze. I don't want my son to be like them, with all those manners and punctuality.
- Cyclops: And after all...why can't a Jew love his country like the next fellow?
- M(Z): This problem had a very long history. But I must confess that it is **not** common to Moscow **now**.

- F(Z): This vile is undefeated...The Jewish question is unsolvable.
- F(D): I don't think that there is anything wrong with our nation. Russian people are not racist or chauvinistic. Of course, you can often hear in a tram, 'You, damn non-Russian dirt, should have been squashed like a cockroach even by Ivan, the Terrible!' So what! No big deal.
- M(S): ...feeling like a second-brand person in your own country...a herd / of **academic cattle**. [He breathes with difficulties.] To be honest, I am one of them. I should have fought.
- F(D); Most immigrants here do not conceal their hatred to Russia, with its drunk smelly males and anti-Semitism ☹ ☹ ☹ !!! Immigrants are overfull of bitterness toward Russia...Unlike them, I do not spread the anti-Soviet propaganda and do not employ anti-Soviet slogans in my classes ☹. Unlike them, I do not blame the Soviet Union!
- M(E): Gosh, what an amazing country it was! The further apart I stay from it, the better I understand that it was a **COLOSSAL EXPERIMENT**.

APPENDIX D: PLAY 'CYCLOPS' CAVE' (ABRIDGED)

...We came to the land of the lawless and inhuman Cyclopes... a huge monster...he rolled a huge stone to the mouth of the cave - so huge that two and twenty strong four-wheeled wagons would not be enough to draw it from its place against the doorway.

(Homer, *The Odyssey*, Book IX)

List of Characters

Narrator:	Lecturer at a US University; half Jewish-half Russian; age 'D'; left Russia in 1978
Interviewer:	Researcher (myself)
M(Z):	Reader at a small UK University; Jewish; age 'B'
M(Q) :	Senior Research/Group Leader at a UK University; Jewish; age 'C'
M(G):	Professor at a US University; half Jewish-half Russian; age 'D'
M(J):	Professor at a US University; Jewish; age 'D'
M(B):	Assistant Professor at a US University; half Jewish-half Russian; age 'B'
M(X):	Professor at a Canadian university; Jewish; age 'B'
M(O): f	Lecturer at a UK University; Russian anti-Semite; age 'A'
M(E):	Reader at a UK University; Russian; age 'C'
F(Z):	Reader at a small UK University; Jewish; age 'B'
Bloom:	Protagonist from Joyce' <i>Ulysses</i>

Cyclops:	collective image of anti-Semite from Joyce's <i>Ulysses</i> , Chapter 12)
Vysotsky:	Soviet poet Vladimir Vysotsky
Hitler:	Adolf Hitler
Goring:	Herman Goring, from the Nazi Germany (cited in Friedlander (1997))

Act I: Entering the Cave

My maiden surname was officially Russian because I had taken that of my mother when I was nine years old. My mother was Russian and my father *Aaron* was a Jew with a typical Jewish surname. When everyone was scared by The Doctors' Plot in 1952 my parents were persuaded to change my surname into that of my Mom. My Dad was scared to death that we all would be imprisoned and decided to transfer me to my Mom's surname. But it did not save me from being recognised as a Jew! ...

M(J): You know...it is all my wrong ethnicity...[He laughs and coughs nervously and fastens his speech].

M(Z): In the Soviet Union they *always* made it clear what your ethnicity was [He grins sadly and swallows air].

F(Z): You would never stop being a Jew in the Soviet Union...First I was so naive hoping that a marriage to a Russian guy would deprive me of my Jewishness if I change my surname.

There were several situations when my Jewish patronymic name '*Aaronovna*' [the daughter of Aaron] let me down despite my purely Russian last name. After graduation I was recommended by my former instructor to apply for a faculty job at the MSU. Unfortunately our Dean was an absolute anti-Semite. Our graduation fell on very misfortunate years. 1967 brought in the first wave of anti-Semite war and the consequent emigration of Jews. You could feel the absolute anti-Semitism in the air, the bare anti-Semitism in its ugly configurations. The Dean plainly said in a very

cynic manner to the department head, who was *pro me*, that with my middle name, the department would exceed the limits of the statistically allowed demographic norm.

M(Q): [hiding his face behind his cup of coffee]...hardly anyone suspected that I was a Jew because of my non-Jewish appearance and my atypically Jewish surname. But there are people on whose foreheads their Jewish blood is just stamped. That is why neither their childhood nor their youth was envy evoking. For example, my friend M(Z) often recalls having been frequently trodden on.

M(Z): Everyone knew that there might be problems because of my Jewish blood. [He speaks very nervously and quickly].

...My middle name 'Aaronovna' made it clear for everyone that *I was a Jew*.

M(J): *Wrong surname...wrong blood...weird ethnicity...*

Because of this label, my access to the academic profession was firmly denied by the Dean.

F(Z): ...at college I was dreaming about an academic career, the career of scholar. But it was a sand castle...It was impossible for me because I was a Jew and by the 1980s it had become unrealistic for a person with *the wrong number five* to get a job at an academic institution.

After the elimination, I had nothing else to do than to pick up casual stupid jobs on which I had worked for eight years before in 1976 I started teaching in another department of the MSU. I had got there because of my undergraduate advisor's connections. Unfortunately, it was a department not specialising in my research area. That is why I felt caged and defenceless.

F(Z): All my misfortunes were due to my Jewishness. Entering the SAS, I was accepted as a temporary employee - fired and hired again every three months. The head of that institution was said not to hire Jews in principle. And I had nothing else to do than

wrestle uneasy on temporary jobs praying for his mercy. That was so humiliating.

M(Z): When I was graduating from the University, the Dean's office could not find a workplace for me. They did not know any place where I could be wanted because of my ethnicity...no postgraduate school and no lab wanted me as a student or as an employee. Finally I managed to get an insignificant office job. Having wasted the whole five years of humiliation and uncertainty on that stupid position, I was eventually fired.

M(J): There were a couple of unpleasant things happening to my wife because of my wrong last name. Once the Head of the Institute [a peripheral branch of the SAS], my friend, by the way, told my wife, 'It is a pity that your husband has an *unsuitable surname*. Otherwise I would hire you!' ...When my wife asked the principal why she was not given promotion, he said, 'I have another why-question for you. Why did you marry a Jew? What did he have that we, Russian males, don't? You made your choice yourself long ago. Why to ask "why"?'

Cyclops: Pity about her...Or any other woman marries a half and half...Half and half I mean...A fellow that's neither fish nor flesh...Nor good red herring... Circumcised!

Hitler: The Jewish youth lies in wait for hours on end...spying on the unsuspecting German girl he plans to seduce...He wants to contaminate her blood and remove her from the bosom of her own people.

In 1971 I started passing the entrance exams to the same postgraduate school. And again the same old story repeated. The department head and all the staff wanted me as a colleague very frankly...The main requirement for the entrance to the daytime postgraduate school at any humanitarian faculty was to have 'A' on both the final undergraduate and the entrance postgraduate exam on Scientific Communism...Though I knew that subject almost by heart (we had passed it so many times during our undergraduate studies!), I was *frankly* being "attacked" because the teacher had been given the command not to mark my answer as 'A'. As a result, I got 'B'. The Dean said that the only chance for me to get to the postgraduate school was to study that course as extra-mural. My grades

automatically granted me the admission to the extra-mural module of postgraduate studies at the MSU. You know there is a proverb, 'You can't fight the city hall!'

F(Z): Some say, 'Fight!' Others say, 'Reconcile yourself to your fate!' There are also parents who tell their children, 'Leave the country!' It is easy to say, 'Fight!' How? This vile was omnipresent. Reconciliation? As if it were possible! Shall one flee? Where? As if it were that easy! What we actually had was Catch-22: there was no way out. There was actually no safe place to hide.

I was recommended by my former tutor, a professor with the world-known name. It meant *nothing* to him. It was our *Dean, an ardent anti-Semite*, who was delivering the anti-Semitic policy *very zealously and meticulously*...He *dared* to express his anti-Semitism in plain words to an official figure – the department head and a top academic!

M(Z): A famous professor and the vice principal were pro me. But the Principal said no and closed the question.

...Isn't it funny that it happened to me *twice*? [The Narrator laughs nervously.]

F(Z): I had been used to it...I had been turned down from many places for that reason.

M(Q): For example, my friend M(Z)...The 'Jew-scanning experts' – those who made decisions about academic recruitment – immediately recognised the Jewish blood in him. It was hard because he has a typically Jewish surname 'Shlomov'. 'Shlomo' is a short name for Solomon. That is why everything was always crystal clear about him

Act II: Thin Ice

Such a *cynic* response from the FACULTY DEAN at a high rank school had seemed unimaginable to me before that event!!! I had not been able to suppose that someone could say, 'With her middle name, she does not fit the allowed

demographic picture at your department'. What he actually meant was, 'There are a lot of Jews at your department as it is. Enough! We don't want another one!'

Interviewer: Why does she call him cynic all the time?

M(B): In those years the MSU was...an intellectual Mecca of anti-Semites. Yes, they were cynics. They could easily tell anti-Semitic jokes at lectures.

Interviewer: Were they really that cynical?

M(Q): Yes, they were. 'Cynics' is the right word. In general, they impressed me as very barbaric in their perception of Jews.

M(Q): Let those Jewish boys and girls go and work as proletariat. Though it will not solve the problem: they still will get into the University sooner or later because most of them are really capable.

...Well, you know...[she is very perplexed, still decides to talk]...it had happened to me many times before but not like that! There was a lot of everyday dirt on the level of verbal offence. But I never paid attention to it...JUST IMAGINE!!! He dared to tell our teacher to make me unfit for the daytime programme! He could not forget about that *second, Jewish, half* in my blood.

I remember myself as a teenager walking home from school, past the alehouse. There was almost always someone who shouted at me, 'Kike!' Of course, it was *very painful*. But those things *never* play a significant role in people's lives. A real catastrophe is when you enter the University, the postgraduate school, or the job market, because in such cases the decision comes from official persons.

M(X): That inadequate attitude was constantly coming out from the University administration. It was the matter of politics.

M(Q): Of course, those who were running all that politics, including the University administration, kept displaying very personal, Neanderthal, disgust to Jews. Of course, they were governed by the primitive, folk, anti-Semitism in their political decisions. I personally knew such people. I would say they had very primitive emotions about Jews.

Vysotsky: Along major highways they grabbed all the lots,
Built luxury dachas and live there like gods.⁷⁰
I'll maim and I'll burn, just to make them pay dues -
To save our country, I'll club dirty Jews.

M(Q): ...very primitive sentiments...But on the whole, if to take those people, I mean those administrators, all together and if to sum up all their actions, what they had been doing was perceived as the state politics, as sort of state-level force.

Interviewer: How did you feel about it?

M(Q): When I was eliminated, it happened to me for the first time and so spontaneously that I was not able to understand how tragic it was... Now I try to think, 'It's all over the hill'.

...Oh God! I could not believe that it had happened to me! Even the reminiscence makes me grow numb with cold. [*She almost screams*]. How *could* he? **WHY?**

F(Z): ...a subconscious search for a scapegoat....

M(Q): ...the Jewish diaspora...fully blood-sucking the Soviet people; a drone fed up on the Soviet life. They pursue education; make their off-spring study hard...books, piano, foreign languages...never drink alcohol or hang around the streets. We, Russian people, are not so boring. We love fun and booze. I don't want my son to be like them, with all those manners and punctuality. I want him to be like me when he grows up.

Narrator: 'With her patronymic name...', he said. It was like *an emotional upheaval* for him to announce to me that I was a Jew.

Hitler: I began to hate Jews...For me this was the time of the greatest spiritual upheaval I have ever had to go through.

M(Q): I think Russia must belong to Russians. How else to save the our culture from defilement!

Narrator: The most disgusting in the whole story was the fact of *rejecting me as a person on the grounds of my ethnicity* rather than my professional characteristics.

⁷⁰ 'Dacha' (Russian) means 'summer cottage'.

- M(Z): In the 1980s career progression was an extremely complex and troublesome adventure *for a Jew*. It depended on *peculiar* circumstances. *That ice was always very thin*. The threat was always hanging in the air. It went without saying that you could be eliminated at any moment. Everybody knew that.
- M(S): It was not a good idea to be a Jew in the Soviet Union.
- Goring: I would not wish to be a Jew in Germany.⁷¹
- M(O): ...those Jews have everything...suck our blood ...
- Hitler: ...a people of robbers...
- Cyclops: A dark horse...a bloody dark horse...swindling the taxes off of the Government and appointing consuls all over the world.
- Bloom: Mendelssohn was a Jew and Karl Marx and Mercadante and Spinoza.
- Cyclops: A wolf in sheep's clothing...Defrauding widows and orphans.
- Bloom: Persecution...all the history of the world is full of it. Perpetuating national hatred among nations.
- Cyclops: But do you know what a nation is?
- Bloom: A nation is the same people living in the same place.
- Cyclops: What is your nation...?
- Bloom: I was born *here*...
- Narrator: Russia will always remain in my heart as something intrinsic.
- M(X): I have not forgotten that I am originally from Russia, though now I am an academic gipsy, wandering from one University to another around the world.
- Interviewer: Do you like it?
- M(X): No, I don't. I would prefer to be close to my ancestors' tombs. This is the way a normal person should live. But it *did not work out*.
-

Bloom: I was born *here*...And I belong to a race too...that is hated and persecuted. Also now. This very moment. This very instant.

Cyclops: Are you talking about the New Jerusalem?

Bloom: I'm talking about injustice...

M(O): PARASITES...Jewish kids matched the requirements of mathematical schools in many more cases than Russian children. That is why there were many more Jews in Moscow mathematical schools...DRONES...On the day of our 10th annual high school reunion I could not believe my eyes when I saw those former angel-looking Jewish boys, who had used to be my classmates, having turned into business sharks. Absolutely incredible! ...

Bloom: Your god was a Jew like me.

M(O): This is not fair that Jews are climbing up...

Cyclops: And after all...why can't a Jew love his country like the next fellow?

Hitler: No Jew...may be a member of the nation.

M(O): I don't think that there is anything wrong with our nation.

F(Z): Anti-Semitism was undefeated in the Soviet Union.

M(E): Gosh, what an amazing country it was! The further apart I stay from it, the better I understand that it was a **COLOSSAL EXPERIMENT!**

CHART 1: ACADEMIC CAPITALISM TERMINOLOGY

<i>Term</i>	<i>Behaviours and trends the term depicts</i>	<i>Purpose(s) of using this term</i>
1. Globalization	The global spread of business and services to a world market through multi-national companies and the internet. Applying to education, it is a set of political and economic shifts that evoke national policy makers to change the way tertiary education functions.	To show the dimension of economic change in education
2. Commercialization =corporatization =commodification	A wide range of business relevant behaviours and trends, notably: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the influence of economic forces on universities and their curricula; the influence of the surrounding corporate culture on academia (the penetration of business terminology such as "bottom line" and "brand name" into campus life); efforts use administrative methods adapted from business; and/or attempts to quantify University outcomes that are truly qualifiable (for example, introduction of TQM) 	To capitalise on the widespread distrust of business methods in academic circles. (-)
3. Marketization	Academic activities (such as teaching and research) that can be well paid for on the market, including the orientation towards commercial research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To pinpoint profit-seeking activities of Universities (-) To refer to the dichotomy: market-oriented v. fundamental research (-)
4. Academic entrepreneurship	Opportunities to make money - to benefit - from intellectual work: any market-like activities that help Universities and faculty adjust to and benefit by academic capitalism. It is the adaptation mechanism in marketization.	To underline the positive effects of academic capitalism – those that may enrich the academy. The term is often used as a euphemism for (1 and 3) and associated with financial success.
5. Expansion/globalization	Quantitative and qualitative changes in academe: massification (-), institutional differentiation and functional modifications.	To show the range of change and to stress that modern academy is different from the pre-industrial Universities
6. Corporate culture	The culture of academic capitalism at modern Universities, which is new and complex.	To refer to the complexity of organizational change especially in instructional/departamental relations.
7. Risk society/ risk culture	The academic capitalism culture, which requires high technology and new relations relevant to it.	To stress the difficulty of cultural adaptations and the danger of not having the post-industrial base in market-like activities on campus. (-)

Adapted and modified from Deem (2003; 2004); Gellert (1993); Slaughter & Leslie (1997).

CHART 2: PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS MATRIX

Name	Age in May-September 2005	Academic Domain	Recent Location	Whole story: long & reflexive (good for overall analysis)	Topics well covered in "bad" or short stories (good for analysis)	Good quotes from "bad" or short stories
1. F(X)	63	Russian Studies	USA	Yes !!!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Anti-Semitism ❖ Nostalgia ❖ Impact of communism 	<p>I am dying for Russia – but now I cannot live without America either.</p> <p>Russia will be always in my heart but America is in my blood now.</p> <p>A woman can be a much better mathematician than a man but she has fewer less opportunities for this career.</p>
2. F(Y)	61	Maths	UK (Professor's wife and housewife)	Yes !!!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Family-work balance ❖ Impact of communism ❖ Russian science ❖ Anti-Semitism ❖ Soviet collapse 	<p>You should set a goal and go for it, even if you break your own neck.</p> <p>To succeed, one should find a good advisor and pull knowledge from him.</p>
3. F(Q)	31	Molecular biology	UK	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Work conflict (a bad boss story) ❖ Soviet life ❖ A mentor story ❖ Intellectual work ❖ Implicit Jewry ❖ Self-identity crisis ??? 	<p>With a smile, I have tested many waters.</p> <p>A woman's life is no picnic. Yet she can do a lot.</p>
4. F(D)	48	Russian Studies	USA	Long !!! Reflexive ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Work conflict ❖ Communist Party ❖ Woman & career ❖ Implicit national discrimination ❖ Western environment <p>Postgraduate education in the Soviet Union</p>	

5. X(Z)	41	Sociology	UK	No	❖ Jewry facts !!!	❖ My dad used to say, "Mind your Jewish nose & never fly too high"
6. F(W)	45	Russian Studies	UK	No	❖ Woman & career in the West ❖ Academic work in the West ❖ Russianness	❖ Work swallows 90% of my life. That is why, I could not afford to have another baby.
7. F(B)	36	Physics	UK	Long ??? Reflexive !!	❖ Russianness ❖ Academic work in the West ❖ Woman & career ❖ Self-identity crisis	❖ I don't want to lose myself in another culture. Now I am trying to reconstruct my authentic identity, my Russianness. ❖ I don't know what future I have.
8. F(E)	41	Maths	USA	Average	❖ Academic work in the West ❖ Immigrant identity ❖ State of Russian science today ❖ Soviet anti-Semitism	❖ What is going on in the West now reminds me very much of the Soviet Union
9. F(H)	41	Maths	USA	No	❖ Soviet anti-Semitism ❖ Immigrant identity	❖ I am trying to restore the Soviet mathematics in the West for those who are truly keen on knowing it.
10. F(V)	26	Maths	UK	No	❖ New generation of Russian diaspora ❖ Academic profession versus commercial research	❖ I don't know why I am here [in the West]. ❖ I am in the academia as long as I do not see other, more tempting, employment perspectives.
11. M(Y)	65	Maths	UK	Yes	❖ Impact of communism ❖ Anti-Semitism ❖ Commercialization of science	❖ Academic vandalism ❖ Academic banditism

12. M(S)	64	Maths	USA	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The nature of talent and inspiration ❖ Problems of teaching ❖ Impact of communism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ If my country does not need me any more – I will go and find another one for myself. ❖ I was no better than them – I should have fought. ❖ Never kowtow to your boss; never lie down before him. ❖ I am not going to say now that I was a hero fighting injustice. Regardless of how disgusting it may be now to admit – I <i>was there, among them all</i>, ‘building’ communism. Otherwise, how else would I have made my career?
13. M(H)	59	Physics	UK	Long ? Reflexive ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Academic gate-keeping ❖ A mentor story ❖ Promotion ❖ Academic leadership ❖ Commercialization of Ru academy (work for military) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ I am a meteorite, a shell piece here [in the US]. I am somewhere in-between. ❖ I don’t have anything to do with Jewry yet my promotion was impeded in the USSR because my mother was a Jew.
14. M(G)	70	Maths	USA	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Motivation ❖ Academic work in the Soviet Union, betrayal and promotion ❖ Jewry fact ❖ Russianness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The principal told my wife, “Why did you marry a Jew?” ❖ An academic woman must be in a good working shape. That is why, the husband must understand that her career is the family’ future. I always say that to my daughters. I always tell them not to sacrifice their careers.
15. M(J)	63	Physics	USA	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Jewry fact ❖ Academic family ❖ The doctor and the doctor’s wife ❖ Academic career in the West ❖ Woman and career 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The principal told my wife, “Why did you marry a Jew?” ❖ An academic woman must be in a good working shape. That is why, the husband must understand that her career is the family’ future. I always say that to my daughters. I always tell them not to sacrifice their careers.

16. M(Z)	42	Maths	UK	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Jewry facts ❖ Career trajectory ❖ Career choice ❖ Motivation for emigration ❖ Perception of the Soviet masculinity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ I had no other choice than to leave Russia: my life had been destroyed. Of course, I could stay and go into business but I was a mathematician. Everything was so disgusting. ❖ Academic life is very dirty. Yet a man mustn't complain or share ❖ A victim of anti-Semitism, as described by his friends
17. M(S)	50	Molecular biology	UK	Long ? Reflexive !!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Motivation ❖ Promotion ❖ Academic work in the West ❖ Work conflict ❖ Intellectual work ❖ Russianness & masculinity (the author of the poem) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ We were fizzled out to the West, as if from the uncorked bottle of champagne. ❖ A talented scientist must have a "killer instinct" he should achieve his end despite any obstacles. ❖ A true intellectual, as described by his friends.
18. M(X)	48	Maths	UK and Canada	Long ??? Reflexive !!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Jewry ❖ Intellectual diaspora facts ❖ Career choice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Russia has lost many mathematicians because of the Jewish question. ❖ I am an academic gipsy. ❖ Living in another country I would have chosen another occupation. If we had been free from the Soviet ideology, I would have become a lawyer.

19. M(Q)	50	Molecular biology	UK	Long ! Reflexive ! <i>Inconsistent</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature of academic work Academic work in the West Woman & career Some Jewry facts Promotion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Science is a dirty work I became the victim of my ex-wife' despotism.
20. M(Q)	31	Maths	UK	Long ! Reflexive !? Interesting ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jewry from the other side Academic motivation Alma Mater & "academic paradise" story Russianness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am not going to stay in the West forever: I am Russian and I think I haven't done anything for Russia yet. Those Jews have grabbed everything
21. M(B)	40	Physics	USA	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jewry facts Academic work in the West Russianness Emigration fact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Life here [in the USA] is so boring – not for a Russian person. I don't know who I am: Russian, Israeli, or Soviet
22. M(W)	35	Physical engineering	USA	Long !!! Reflex. - ???	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed career trajectory Promotion Academic management Cross-cultural awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not respect those Russian academics who try to assimilate and speak English without an accent. I consider them dandies. Everything depends on a person: if you really want anything, you will get it. But first you should estimate how much you need it.
23. M(R)	35	Petroleum engineering	UK	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motivation for emigration Life in Russia now Cultural adjustment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not understand those Russian academics who complain about living in the West.

CHART 3: INDIVIDUAL DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS

#	Participants	Present Rank	Education	Area	Age	Ethnicity	Racial bias	Sympathy to Jews	Neutral to Jews	Host country
1	M(Y)	Full Professor	DrSc	Maths	65	Russian		+		UK
2	F(Y) - M(Y)'s wife	Housewife	U	Maths	61	Russian		+		UK
3	M(Q)	Lecturer	US PhD	Maths	31	Russian	+			UK
4	M(B)	Assistant Professor	Israel PhD	Physics	42	Mixed Jew				US
5	M(X)	Full Professor	Kand.	Maths	50	Jew				Canada
6	F(B)	Lecturer	Kand.	Physics	36	Russian			+	UK
7	M(E)	Reader	Kand.	Molecular Biology	51	Russian			+	UK
8	M(H)	Researcher	DrSc	Physics	60	Russian	+			UK
9	M(S)	Full Professor	DrSc	Maths	63	Russian		+		US
10	M(Z)	Reader	Kand.	Maths	42	Jew				UK
11	F(Q)	Researcher	UK PhD	Molecular Biology	31	Jew				UK
12	M(G)	Full Professor	DrSc	Maths	68	Mixed Jew				US
13	M(Q)	Researcher	Kand.	Molecular Biology	51	Jew				UK
14	F(X)	Lecturer	U	Philology	63	Mixed Jew				US
15	F(Z)	Reader	Kand.	Sociology	42	Jew				UK
16	M(J)	Full Professor	Kand.	Physics	63	Jew				US
17	F(D)	Lecturer	Kand.	Philology	48	Tatar	+			US
18	F(W)	Reader	UK PhD	Philology	45	Russian	+			UK
19	M(W)	Researcher	Kand.	Physics	35	Russian			+	UK
20	F(V)	Reader	Kand.	Maths	27	Russian			+	UK
21	F(E)	Researcher	US PhD	Maths	40	Jew				US
22	F(H)	Schoolteacher	U	Maths	40	Jew				US

- ✓ **DrSc** – the Soviet/Russian degree of “doctor of Science
- ✓ **Kand** – the Soviet/Russian degree of “Kandidat nauk” or the Russian PhD
- ✓ **U** – undergraduate degree from a Soviet/Russian University

CHART 4(a): QUANTITATIVE SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS' DEMOGRAPHICS

#		Overall #	Gen der		Age (if relevant)					Ethnic Group			
			Male	Female	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	Russian	Full Jewish	Mixed Jewish	Other
Demographic													
Gender	All participants	22	12	10	1	4	8	3	7	12	8	3	1 (Tatar)
	Male	12	12	-	-	2	2	3	5	8	4	2	-
	Female	10	-	10	1	2	6	-	2	4	4	1	1
Anti-Semitic/racist prejudice in non-Jews		4	2	2	-	1	2	-	1	3	-	-	1
Present status	Professor	5	5	-	-	-	-	1	4	2	2	1	-
	Reader/Associate Professor	4	2	2	-	-	3	1	-	2	2	-	-
	Lecturer/Assistant Professor	5	2	3	-	2	2	-	1	2	-	2	1
	Contract researcher	6	3	3	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	-	-
	Other	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	-

CHART 4(b): QIANTITATIVE SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS' DEMOGRAPHICS

#		Overall #	Gen der		Age (if relevant)					Ethnic group				
Demographic			Male	Female	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	Russian	Full Jewish	Mixed Jewish	Other	
Education														
Russian Doctor of Science	Russian Dr.Sc. holders	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	4	3	-	1	-	
	Russian Dr.Sc. holders without full professorship	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	
	Holders of Russian PhD only	9	6	3	-	2	3	3	1	3	5	-	1	
Russian PhD	Holders of Russian PhD and full professorship in the West	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	1		2	-	-	
	Holders of UK/US PhD	6	2	4	1	2	3	-	-	3	2	1	-	
Western PhD	Holders of UK/US PhD working as contract researchers	3		3	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	
	UK	13	7	6	1	4	3	2	3	9	4	-	-	
Host country (now)	USA	8	4	4	-	-	3	-	5	1	3	3	1	
	Canada	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	
Area of research	Maths	10	6	4	1	1	3	1	4	4	4	1	-	
	Physics	5	4	1	-	2	1	-	2	3	1	1	-	
	Molecular biology	3	2	1	-	1	-	2	-	1	2	-	-	
	Humanities	4	-	4	-	-	3	-	1	1	1	1	1	

CHART 5: JEWISH INFORMANTS

<i>Informant</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Year of emigration</i>	<i>Host country now</i>	<i>Present University</i>	<i>Present Rank</i>	<i>Last ed-n</i>	<i>Last Russian job</i>	<i>Specialty</i>
Jewish women									
1. F(Q)	FN	31	2001	UK	UK	Researcher	UK PhD	SAS, Moscow	Molecular biology
2. F(E)	VFT	40	1990	USA	USA	Researcher	US PhD	Peripheral University	Maths
3. F(H)	VFT	40	1995	USA	USA (non-academic)	School admin-r	Soviet Russian under.	Peripheral University	Maths
4. F(Z)	LN	42	1990	UK	UK	Reader	Soviet Russian PhD	SAS, Moscow	Sociology
5. F(X)	ELN	63	1978	USA	USA	Lecturer	Soviet Russian under.	Unemployed	Philology
Jewish men									
6. M(B)	FN	41	1991	USA	USA	Assistant Professor	Israeli PhD	RAS, Moscow	Physics
7. M(Z)	LN	42	1990	UK	UK	Reader	Soviet Russian PhD	Unemployed	Maths
8. M(X)	LN	50	1990	Canada	Canada	Professor	Soviet Russian PhD	SAS, Landau, Moscow	Maths
9. M(Q)	LN	52	1995	UK	UK	Researcher	Soviet Russian PhD	RAS, Moscow	Molecular biology
10. M(J)	LN	63	1990	USA	USA	Professor	Soviet PhD	SAS, Novosibirsk	Physics
11. M(G)	LN	68	1990	USA	USA	Prof-r	DrSc	MSU	Maths

- ELN – extra-long narrative
- LN – long narrative
- FN – fragmental narrative
- VFT – very fragmental narrative, used for triangulation
- SAS – Soviet Academy of Sciences (now RAS)
- RAS – Russian Academy of Sciences (former SAS)

Chart 6: Vocational life stages

Adapted from Super et al. (1965: 38-42)

<i>Stage</i>		<i>Age</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
1. GROWTH	a. Fantasy	4-10	Role-playing
	b. Interest	11-12	Determination of likes and dislikes
	c. Capacities	13-14	Measurement of balance between abilities and training
	a. Tentative	14-18	❖ Emergence of more differentiated and stable vocational interests ❖ Increasing realism of adolescents' preferences
2. EXPLORATION			
	b. Transition	18-21	❖ Entrance to the labour market ❖ Implementation of a self-concept
	c. Trial	22-25	Finding a beginning job and trying it as a life work
3. ESTABLISHMENT	a. Trial	26-30	❖ Dissatisfaction with the field of work ❖ Understanding that life is a succession of unrelated jobs
	b. Stabilization	31-44	Establishment of a career and a way of life – the most creative years
4. MAINTENANCE		45-65	❖ Consolidation of gains ❖ Status quo maintenance
5. DECLINE		65 -...	Retirement